

# BACONIANA

VOL. XXX.

No. 118.

January 1946

## EDITORIAL NOTES.

A CHARACTERISTIC example of the unscrupulous audacity with which the Stratfordians endeavour to build up the life of Will Shakspeare has recently emerged in a letter appearing in the Church newspaper, *The Guardian*, under date of October 26th. The writer of the letter, of which we cite the main argument, uses only his initials 'R.E.B.', and he was taking exception to the allusion in a previous issue of *The Guardian* that Shakspeare (he spells it 'Shakespeare' of course) was caught poaching in Sir Henry Lucy's park at Charlccote, which, by the by, has recently been presented to the nation. He then continues:

Years ago, Dr. Gray, of Cambridge, perhaps the greatest authority on Shakespeare we have had, practically disposed of the "butcher and grazier" theory in his book.

But briefly, his thesis was that, although Shakespeare might have been born at Stratford, he went at an early age as page into the household of Sir Francis Goodere at Polesworth. Dr. Gray, also an authority on Michael Drayton, had noted the line, "My mildest mannered tutor whose name belies his nature," the point of which was that Drayton, who as a boy lived near Polesworth, got his elements from Dr. Savage who was then Vicar of Polesworth. It was because Drayton made acquaintance with Shakespeare in his school days (though they were never afterwards very cordial, not even after retirement to Stratford, which they did almost together) that Dr. Gray began his research. Admittedly the evidence is not much more than circumstantial, but it is so strong that it almost amounts to *certainly*—that Shakespeare spent his boyhood and young manhood at Polesworth, and was never in a position to poach game at Charlcote. One particular point of internal evidence is worth consideration: that in the "ragged army's" advance to Shrewsbury, he took them through the country he knew best, instead of by the main road through Stratford.

The question has been asked, Where did Shakespeare get his history? and might be asked also of Drayton. The answer is, at Polesworth, for at Bramshall Hall, Polesworth, there lived the historian of the time, Dr. Holinshed, from whom the pair undoubtedly learned history, and something more than history.

As to William's dramatic art, and his association with the stage, it can be accounted for by his association with the Earl of Southampton, who it is known visited Pooley Hall, Polesworth, annually, with his players. That Shakespeare had a struggle afterwards to make good we allow; but it is not necessary to vulgarize his beginnings.

These extraordinary "claims" to have disposed of the butcher and grazier element in Shakspeare's earlier life by Prof. Arthur Gray's "discovery" were exposed in this journal in our issue of April 1943. In his work, *An Early Chapter in the Life of Shakespeare*, published in 1926, this gentleman attempted to dodge the impassable barrier between the facts known of the life of Stratford Will, bookless, uneducated, without even a shred of evidence that he was ever a pupil at Stratford Grammar School, by drawing on his imagination and supplying a totally different early career for his hero. He therefore invented the fiction that as a boy he got a job as a page at the house of Sir Henry Goodere at Polesworth. As Drayton at a tender age entered Goodere's household at Polesworth, why not Shakspeare? *The Nuneaton Chronicle* of January 1st, 1943, published a purely fanciful article headed, "Shakespeare in Polesworth," by some other adherent of Professor Gray, of which the following is an extract:

"And as I walked again in Arden, amid the red-roofed black and white cottages of Polesworth; renewed old and friendly contacts with church and vicarage; lingered long and blissfully by the bridge. Time moved as slowly and peacefully as Anker (river).

"Out of this still beauty a voice spoke. Shakespeare, it whispered impressively, *must have been at school in Polesworth*. Was he not familiar with the place-names—Tamworth, Hinckley, Greete, Wincot and the rest? Did not Richard (sic) Holinshed once live in the forest nearby? Where, but in the enlightened home of Sir Henry Goodere, could our Shakespeare have lived his youthful years? Was I listening to the authentic voice of Shakespeare himself? Surely, that was it! He and I, grown timelessly young again, were creeping unwillingly to school."

Such was the sort of drivel a wild professor had fathered and it still keeps on. It is a cliché to assert that a good lie, with a big start, is difficult to catch up and may have done a world of harm when nailed down. But it can also apply to a silly lie among persons who are ignorant. Polesworth lies, as a matter of fact, at the other extreme of the county, a long and difficult journey in Elizabethan days, as Mr. R. L. Eagle pointed out in commenting on the above fairy tale. Moreover, the places named in the article cited have no connection with either the Stratford or the Polesworth districts. Tamworth, Warwickshire, is near the scene of the battle in Richard III. Hinckley is in the Gloucestershire scene of Part 2, Henry IV. Wincot has never been identified with any certainty and there is no such place as Greete mentioned in the plays.

\* \* \*

It is scarcely worth while pursuing this literary will-o'-the-wisp, except in so far as it serves to expose the utter lack of principle of the Stratfordian people. Drayton, who was about a year older than Shakspeare, was born in the immediate neighbourhood of Polesworth and his presence in the Goodere *ménage* is understandable. He recognised his debt to Sir Henry for the culture he imbibed under his roof. Had the two boys shared this experience there should have



sprung up a certain intimacy between them in their careers, but as a playwright Drayton wrote for the Admiral's men, who were rivals of Burbage, and there was little love lost between them. Apart from all this, Polesworth could not have provided "Shakespeare" with his intimate knowledge of France and Italy, of the laws, customs and languages of these countries, or of his consummate familiarity with the classic writers, many of whom are comparatively obscure. It certainly would not have furnished him with the intricate knowledge of jurisprudence of which Shakespeare was a master. If Prof. Arthur Gray is, "perhaps," the greatest authority on Shakespeare, as the writer in *The Guardian* declares, we would advise the Professor to be more circumspect in future unless he wants to be ranged with Sir Sidney Lee as the greatest Shakespearean contortionist.

How much longer will it take to debunk Stratford-on-Avon? Sir Malcolm Robertson, until recently Chairman of the British Council, wrote a half column letter to *The Daily Telegraph* on Nov. 26th, in which he complained that we do not make enough of Stratford as a national institution. "Stratford is unique as the birthplace of Shakespeare and cannot be taken from us," he says, "and my idea is that it should be made the acknowledged centre of the world." He wants an almost continuous series of Shakespeare's plays staged there, distinguished scholars—Prof. Gray should be on the rota with his Polesworth fantasy—playwrights, poets, actors and actresses invited to give public lectures, added accommodation for the crowds who would throng to visit this honoured spot, and, in fact, to make it a continuous non-stop festivity. He does not include swings and roundabouts, but he visualises greatly increased accommodation, nothing in the nature of Ritz Hotels, but English inns, with well-selected and cooked English foods, a Scots' cook or two, English waiters and waitresses, and English management. Perhaps the wealthy tradesmen of Stratford, who have waxed rich under the Shakespeare myth, might help in the finance, but it is to be feared that somehow or other French, Italian, German and other "friendly aliens" would before long infiltrate to look after the cuisine for English or Scottish cooking and waiting are not likely to make the catering too great a success, though in sorrow as sufferers we say it.

\* \* \*

We have no special quarrel with Sir Malcolm in his exuberant laudation of Stratford, for he is probably only like countless thousands who have never made any study of the subject of the authorship of the plays and sonnets, but he recalls that the British Council for the past few years reserved a number of seats for members of the Allied Forces during the Shakespeare festival. It is a pity, however, that the British Council, who have obtained vast sums from the Treasury to advance British culture, should not have deigned to examine into the facts before spending the taxpayers' money to belaud a man who had not a tittle of right to the immortal works of the great poet. The

British Council has been highly criticised in the last few years over its vast expenditure. According to *The Daily Express*, it plugs Britain in 36 foreign countries and the pluggers' salary list runs into £500,000 a year. There are 142 of them in Turkey, 79 in Spain and Spanish possessions, and 71 among the Argentines, all neutral countries which did not raise a hand to assist the fight for freedom, Shakespeare's invariable theme. "What good does anybody suppose they are doing now?" asks that journal. Sir Malcolm Robertson's plea is to boost up a sham and a fraud in order to perpetuate it.

\* \* \*

Mr. Wilfrid G. C. Gundry has contributed a comprehensive review of the late Dr. Melsome's posthumous work, *The Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy*, and there is no need to say much on the subject here, except, perhaps, to mention that it is selling well, and all students of Francis Bacon and his Shakespearean *alter ego* would do well to place a copy of reference on their bookshelves. It is, nevertheless, justifiable to touch upon a recent review in the columns of "Punch," for that so-called humorous weekly has always prided itself on its fairness towards writers. In its issue of November 28th, Dr. Melsome's work is treated to a tortuous critique by a reviewer who signs it "H.K.," and it is an open secret that his full name is Hugh Kingsmill. This same "H.K." reviewed Mr. Eagle's *Shakespeare: New Views for Old*, and we believe the author complained to the editor of "Punch" that the work was rendered nugatory because "H.K." had wrenched certain arguments from their contexts and were distorted in such a manner as to make them seem absurd. There appeared to be three stages in this type of critique, firstly, by omitting the context; secondly, by taking two lines from what is left, so that nothing is complete or consecutive; and, thirdly, by ridiculing the abortive remainder.

\* \* \*

"H.K." has apparently applied the like methods to Dr. Melsome's book, and by such literary gerrymandering has used the columns of "Punch" in an endeavour to make a great scholar appear an incompetent judge as to the value of evidence. Those who knew the Doctor are well aware that he possessed the greatest gifts, and the judgment for forming accurate deductions from the data before him. He was an eminent surgeon and his success was in no small measure due to his unerring judgment. One might have supposed that, in any case, in view of the passing away of the author, that the critic would have shown a little tolerance if only for the precept *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*. It is difficult to acquit "H.K." with lack of bias. At all events, Hugh Kingsmill is a Stratfordian "diehard." We recollect a book he wrote in conjunction with Hesketh Pearson, called *This Blessed Plot*, which was reviewed in *BACONIANA* in April, 1943. This work showed ignorance concerning what was fact and what was legend and invention, in what purported to be the life of Shakespeare.



*Punch* must possess a peculiar sense of humour if it encourages its reviewers to distort views with which they do not happen to agree, and to ridicule them after stripping them of their vestures. It might even be said that it is extremely unfair as literary criticism, and has not even the saving grace of being amusing.

\* \* \*

Mr. Laurence E. Tanner, M.V.O., F.S.A., Keeper of the Muni-ments and Library at Westminster Abbey, informs us that Edward Bacon (third son of Sir Nicholas by his first wife) went to Westminster School. They have also a record of a "Bacon minor," but no details are recorded. He adds that there is some "slight evidence of a third brother (unnamed) having been there." Mr. Tanner remarks that "I have always hoped that we might claim Francis." As he was born at York House, in the Adelphi region, not far distant from Westminster, and as Sir Nicholas was mainly in residence there until Francis entered Trinity College, Cambridge, at the age of 12 years and 3 months, it is quite possible that he gained his early education at that ancient school, for the scene of his childhood's education has never been fully discovered. It is remarkable how many Westminster scholars proceeded to Trinity. Several of those who contributed to the *Manes Verulamiani* were among them, such as James Duport, Thos. Vincent, Thos. Randolph, William Loe, George Herbert and Henry Ockley, and there may be others yet of those who merely signed their elegies with initials. Some of them put T.C. (Trinity College) after their initials. Had Francis Bacon been a scholar of Westminster it would have been natural and likely that "old boys" should have paid their special tribute to him on his death in 1626.

\* \* \*

Miss K. M. Housden, whose profile sketch of the Roubillac bust of Bacon forms the frontispiece of this issue, in a letter to the Editor makes some interesting observations on the statue itself. This bust, she says, she finds very disappointing from any view except the profile. "I have drawn this as faithfully as I could," she writes, "and you will see that the nose is well-chiselled and finely shaped the upper part of the face is lined with suffering—it is that of a man in torment, the brows sharply drawn together about a deep depression in the forehead. It would be painful to contemplate were it not counteracted by the enigmatic smile." Miss Housden thinks that the lower jaw of the Roubillac bust resembles that of Leicester. Roubillac's dates are 1695-1762 and it is possible that he made the bust from a death-mask of Bacon furnished to him. It is, however, all conjecture, but because a subject is conjectural it does not necessarily mean that it should be debarred, for by such means sometimes hidden clues emerge.

Just as this issue is closing for press we have received from Messrs. Rider & Co., a copy of Mr. Alfred Dodd's latest work, entitled "The Martyrdom of Francis Bacon," which shortness of time prevents our giving more than a cursory notice to this important addition to the bibliography of that great man. The author's expressed aim is to prove incontestably the innocence of Bacon of the charge of bribery and corruption to which he inexplicably pleaded guilty, suffered accordingly the penalties of Impeachment in 1621, and, as everyone acquainted with Mr. Dodd's other works will expect of him, he sets about vigorously and sparing no lashings as he exposes the treachery and dishonesty of modern critics of Bacon by such men as Macaulay and Dean Church. He possesses the gift of being able to portray in vivid language the whole tragic situation whereby the great Lord Chancellor was basely betrayed by scoundrels like Coke and Cranfield, in order to save the face of James I and his worthless favourite Buckingham. The author claims to have collected considerable fresh evidence which makes it abundantly clear that the charges levelled against Bacon could never have been sustained had the case gone to open trial. It is Mr. Dodd's object to prove finally that the gabbling monarch, wittily described by Henry IV as "the wisest fool in Christendom" deliberately commanded Bacon to plead guilty, knowing quite well he was innocent, and that Bacon made his tremendous sacrifice to save a rotten throne.

Now that the fullest exposure of the hole and corner conspiracy is nakedly exposed, hitherto accepted history and the biographies of Bacon's later savage critics are plunged into the melting pot from which it may be hoped that a more truthful model of the cruel event of 1621 may emerge, thus proclaiming to the thinking world the innocence of the man described as "the Wisest, Brightest, Humblest of Mankind." Mr Dodd has written a book which will vie with his "Shakespeare's Sonnet-Diary." It would evoke considerable repercussions and also add largely to the author's fame. It is impossible to enter into details of this exhaustive and even dramatic work, which every student of history should add to his library—the Bacon Society can supply copies to applicants at the published price of 21s.—but it may be mentioned that the volume is a handsome one, fully illustrated and excellently documented. There are over fifty pages alone of notes and appendices, which themselves afford a most valuable glossary to Bacon and his period.

\* \* \*

We regret that in our last issue, through some error, the heading to an article by Mr. R. L. Eagle, dealing with James Agate's theory of collaboration between Bacon and Shaksper, was printed as "A Sitting on Agate." It should have been, of course, "Sitting on A Gate," a little byplay on the name of the well-known critic and his attitude on collaboration. Mr. Agate has always been fair and just in his criticisms and we are pleased to be able to record this. Would other critics indeed were as fair-minded!

THE EDITOR.



## "A HOUSE DIVIDED AGAINST ITSELF."

By W. G. C. GUNDRY.

"The understanding must also be cautioned against the intemperance of systems, so far as regards its giving or withholding its assent; for such intemperance appears to fix and perpetuate idols, so as to leave no means of removing them. . . . Let such, therefore, be our precautions in contemplation, that we may ward off and expel the idols of the den, which mostly owe their birth either to some predominant pursuit, or, secondly, to an excess in synthesis and analysis, or, thirdly, to a party zeal in favour of certain ages, or, fourthly, to the extent and narrowness of the subject."

(*Novum Organum*—Francis Bacon.)

IT may be irritating to many Baconians to have the general recognition of Bacon's authorship of the Shakespeare Plays delayed by the Stratfordian attitude, and their quite natural emotional reaction to the truth: psychologically this is to be expected: the late Lord Moynihan used the expression "the emotional reaction of ignorance to truth," and this well explains the attitude of those who at the cost of embracing any absurdity still cling desperately to the Stratfordian tradition. In writing thus it is not suggested that the bulk of our opponents are anything other than honest, but it seems that they are suffering from the same complex that cramped the mental activities of the mediæval scholiasts.

There is nothing new in this; it took the world many years to abandon the geocentric conception of the universe, and to accept the doctrine of Copernicus; even Bacon himself, in spite of the discovery during his lifetime of Kepler's Third Law,<sup>1</sup> rejected it. Also it should be remembered that without opposition there can be no satisfactory synthesis, inequality being the law of life.

The Stratfordians supply the necessary fulcrum for the Baconian lever by means of which the bust at Trinity Church at Stratford-on-Avon can be removed to give place to the sitting figure of the Verulamian sage at St. Michael's: "*Sic Sedabat.*"

Nor must we revile Bacon's able assistant, Shakspeare, "a stage player with sufficient ingenuity for imposition"; He played his part in the great plan of Bacon for a long drawn out object lesson in the *Inductive Method*, which has already occupied over three centuries; the measure of his success in hoodwinking the world and masking Bacon is to be found in the fact that the bulk of scholars are still believers in what Schlegel has described as "a blind extravagant error."

Belief in the Stratford Myth has placed its supporters on the

<sup>1</sup> Published in 1619. This connects the planets with the sun by uniform relation which is fulfilled by the Earth also, pointing directly to the Sun as the great centre of our system. "Shakespeare does not appear to have got beyond the Ptolemaic system of the universe."—(Elze's *William Shakespeare*, p. 390, quoted by Edwin Reed in his *Coincidences*.)

horns of an uncomfortable dilemma. A typical difficulty which has caused serious cracks in the facade of Shakespearean orthodoxy is the question of Shakespeare's learning—that is the erudition displayed by the *Author* of the *Shakespeare Plays*. The early critics and commentators adopted the theory of illiteracy pretty generally, if not universally, in so far at least as they did not write with their tongue in their cheek. Let us begin with these:—

"Nature only helpt him." Leonard Digges, 1640.

"Taught by none," Dryden, 1667.

"His learning was very little." Thomas Fuller, 1662.

"He was as much a stranger to French as to Latin." Gerald Langbaine, 1691.

"Without learning," and "And though thou hadst small Latin and less Greek."<sup>1</sup> Ben Jonson, 1623.

"The only author that gives ground for a very new opinion that the philosopher, and even the man of the world, may be born as well as the poet." Alexander Pope, 1725.

"An uneducated peasant." Richard Simpson, author of *The School for Shakspeare*.

"He was the product of the spontaneous hand of nature, with no help from art." Joseph Addison.

"Being without education, or experience in those great and public scenes of life which were usually the subject of his thought, he seems to have known the world by intuition." Jonathan Swift.

Gradually as the critical faculty of the commentators was brought to bear in a more exact and scholarly manner on the Plays it became impossible to maintain the belief in the Author's alleged illiteracy: it therefore became increasingly necessary to concede to him some degree of learning, though how Shakespeare obtained it puzzled many scholars, and has induced some to falsify, or, at least, impugn, many truths hitherto regarded as axiomatic in the world of education. To this class of apologists we must affix the label "mixed."

Thus the Rev. N. H. Hudson, L.L.D.: "The author of Shakespeare's plays, whatever he may have been, certainly was not a scholar. He had something vastly better than learning, but he had not that. Shakespeare never philosophises: Bacon never does anything else."

<sup>1</sup> Ben Jonson's opinion is rather suspect: the first opinion may have been expressed before he knew, as we contend he did later on, that Bacon was the Author. This is rather emphasised in the heading of the prefatory verses by him in the First Folio of 1623 where the word "Author" is spelt in very large letters compared to the "Master William Shakespeare" which follows, as though he wished to distinguish between the two. The well-known and oft-quoted lines beginning "And though thou hadst small Latin and less Greek, etc." might easily imply: Even were it a fact that thou hadst small Latin and less Greek, even then I should not hesitate to call to witness the classical authors of Antiquity, both Latin and Greek, as to the superlative quality of thy dramatic work.



The statement that Shakespeare never philosophises is contrary to the opinion of Schiller, Goethe, Coleridge, Jean Paul Richter, and most of the readers of Shakespeare. Dr. Farmer made an attempt to bring the learning displayed in the plays within the compass of a man of Shakspeare's environment. Dr. Johnson admitted he must have Latin to grammaticise his English. Pope credited him with much reading.

Leigh Hunt hedges thus : "Shakespeare, though he had not a College education, was as learned as any man, in the highest sense of the word,—by a scholarly intuition ; he had the spirit of learning." If learning can be obtained by "intuition" it would be well to have the recipe which would be entirely welcome to many a "whining schoolboy creeping like snail unwillingly to school," and also to some of maturer years.

Professor Walter Raleigh, Fellow of Magdalen College and Professor of English Literature in the University of Oxford, after enumerating the classical authors Shakespeare would probably have read by the age of fourteen at school : Ovid, Vergil, Horace, Juvenal, Plautus, Seneca, Cicero, goes on to say, "Yet, for all that, Shakespeare was no Latin scholar, and in his maturer years we find him using a translation, wherever there was one to be had, in preference to the original." And again : "It is possible, but not likely, that he had a smattering of Greek ; if he had, it was so little as to make the question hardly worth a minute investigation." And further : "Shakespeare was one of those swift and masterly readers who know what they want of a book ; they scorn nothing that is dressed in print, but turn over the pages with a quick discernment of all that brings them new information, or jumps with their thought, or tickles their fancy.<sup>1</sup> Such a reader will perhaps have done with a volume in a few minutes, yet what he has taken from it he keeps for years. He is a live man ; and is sometimes wrongly judged by slower wits to be a learned man."

And to give a final quotation from Professor Raleigh : "Of modern French and Italian writers it is clear that those whom he knew best he knew in translation. From the Plays it may be gathered that he had a certain colloquial knowledge of French, and, at the least, a smattering of Italian."

Now read what Professor Dowden writes of Shakspeare's characteristics : "Practical, positive, and alive to material interests, Shakspeare undoubtedly was. But there is another side to his character. About the time that he brought his action against Philip Rogers for the price of malt, [£1.15.10] the poet was engaged upon his *Othello* and his *Lear*. Is it conceivable that Shakspeare thought more of his pounds than his plays ? " In a further passage Professor Dowden seems to incline to a favourable view of Shakspeare's learning : "Quite a little library exists, illustrating the minute acquaint-

<sup>1</sup> "He was no plodder upon books, though he read much, and that with great judgment." Dr. William Rawley in *Resuscitatio*, 1671, describing Bacon.

ance of Shakspeare<sup>1</sup> [sic] with this branch of information and with that: 'The Legal Acquirements of Shakspeare,' 'Shakspeare's knowledge and use of the Bible,' 'Shakspeare's Delineation of Insanity,' 'The Rural Life of Shakspeare,' 'Shakspeare's Garden,' 'The Ornithology of Shakspeare,' 'The Insects mentioned by Shakspeare,' and such like."

Now let us consider testimonies to Shakespeare's learning. Amongst those who have testified to his legal knowledge are Franklin Fiske Heard, Senator Davis, Lord Chief Justice Campbell, Lord Penzance, both judges of the High Court, and Dr. Appleton Morgan. Lord Campbell says:

"To Shakespeare's law, lavishly as he propounds it, there can be neither demurrer, nor bill of exceptions, nor writ of error."

Rowe found traces of the *Electra* of Sophocles in Shakespeare's plays; Colman, of Ovid; Pope, of Dares Phrygius and other Greek authors; Farmer, of Horace and Vergil; Malone, of Lucretius, Statius, Catullus, Seneca, Sophocles and Euripides; Steevens, of Plautus; Knight, of the *Antigone* of Sophocles; White, of the *Alcestis* of Euripides.

Dr. Farmer tried to find the source of all this classical learning in English translations, *but in vain*.

Schlegel, the German critic, was amazed at the extent of the knowledge and the depth of the philosophy of the plays of Shakespeare and did not hesitate to declare the received account of his life to be "a mere fabulous story, a blind and extravagant error."

To conclude the list of warring critics the opinion of those who are frankly puzzled is given:—

"The life of Shakespeare is a fine mystery, and I tremble every day lest something should turn up."—*Dickens*.

"If Shakspeare was Shakespeare, he seems (to speak frankly) to have had a humanity distinct and apart from his genius.—*A. C. Benson*.

"If there was a Shakespeare of earth, as I suspect, there was also one of heaven, and it is of him we desire to know something."—*Henry Hallam*.

"I cannot marry him to his verse."—*Ralph Waldo Emerson*.

So we have two opposite opinions on the subject of Shakespeare's learning; one school says he was unlearned, the other says he was learned, while a third group is confused by the contradictions between Shakspeare, the man of Stratford-on-Avon, and the author of the Shakespeare Plays.

To solve a difficult problem we might do well to follow the

<sup>1</sup> The spelling "Shakspeare" has been adopted in quoting Professor Dowden; elsewhere in this article the same spelling is used to indicate the actor of Stratford-on-Avon except in a quotation where the orthography of the text is followed: the form "Shakespeare" indicates the author of the Plays.



rule of the philosopher Descartes : " Divide a complex problem into its component parts and see which of them can be resolved first ; the rest will be the seat of the problem." The seat of the Shakespeare problem is surely the immense discrepancy which exists between the character of the actor Shakspeare and the erudition displayed in the dramatic works of Shakespeare.

The orthodox Stratfordian, particularly the Shakespearean scholars, carry somewhat the complexion of quacks crying their wares at country fairs in attributing a little cause to much effect ; for these latter profess (on occasion) to sell pills to prevent earthquakes, and the like absurdities, and sometimes find purchasers for their commodities among the vulgar sort and credulous ; and so with these scholars and commentators on Shakspeare's life and Shakespeare's plays, which are so much at variance, be their opinions never so absurd and contrary to human experience and reason, yet will they perforce find acceptance among the crowd who will follow, lured by their scholarship and reputations into the most extravagant follies and beliefs :

*De gustibus non est disputandum.*<sup>1</sup>

The orthodox Shakespearean scholars, with the eyes of their minds firmly concentrated on the plays, have brought into shadowy existence an ideal figure (like the Kesselstadt Death Mask) whose, flesh, blood and nerves are appropriate only to the Author of these plays, and have thus produced a pseudo-biographical being, a mythical figure whose exterior, the more they draw on the dramas for their inspiration, more nearly approximates in appearance to the author of the *Instauratio Magna*. This image has only to be clothed in the robes of a Lord Chancellor to appear as Francis Bacon himself. But these critics obstinately refuse to invest their simulacrum with the robes that would fit so well, and their lay figure, or literary dummy, remains exposed to the fate of the potentate in Hans Andersen's story, *The Emperor's Clothes* ; one day, perhaps, a leading scholar, untrammelled by the Stratford tradition, will exclaim, like the boy in the story, " But he has nothing on ! "

To clothe Shakspeare the actor (not the ideal Shakespeare evoked from a study of the Plays) with the magic robe of Prospero-Bacon is as absurd as to garland a rattlesnake with roses, or, shall we say, stick musk-roses on the head of Bottom ? :

" My Oberon ! what visions have I seen !  
Methought I was enamoured of an ass."

To do this would be to create a literary Frankenstein's monster which would ultimately destroy their reputations as critics, and expose them to endless ridicule.

As has been shown, there exists a very marked difference of opinion among the Orthodox as to the extent of Shakespeare's learning, a mystery that time only is likely to unravel :—

<sup>1</sup> To give a schoolboy's howler translation : " It is useless to fight the wind ! " This meets the case as well as a more exact rendering.

"O Time, thou must untangle this, not I,  
It is too hard a knot for me to untie."

Baconians can look on from "the vantage ground of Truth (a hill not to be commanded) and see the errors, and wanderings, and mists, and tempests, in the vale below."

*Non nostrum tantas componere lites.*

Meanwhile the slowly evolving articulations of the Baconian synthesis, built up by many years of patient research by countless workers, will have their consummation ultimately in not only identifying the true Author of the Plays known as Shakespeare's but also in unmistakably demonstrating the connection between them and Bacon's other philosophic works and thus giving a coherence and a new meaning to his whole vast plan comprised in the *Instauratio Magna*, upon which these plays are destined, in the fullness of time, to shed a blinding light.

When the fact that Francis Bacon is the real Shakespeare is acknowledged by the thinking world, whether this realisation comes as a thunderclap upon the astounded ears of the orthodox Stratfordian scholars and commentators by means of some epoch-making discovery, or by the gradual erosion of the immense structure of fabrication, invention, surmise and falsification which has hitherto supported the Stratford Myth, together with the more venial prevarications and evasions which some scholars have not hesitated to use in its support; but when this happens, the uncommitted part of the educated community will rock with derisive laughter at this centuries old and deliberately planned benevolent deception, while the whole coffle of Commentators, Correctors, Editors, Emendators, Glossers, Rackers of Orthography and Critics of the Shakespeare Canon will seek to hide their diminished heads in a well-merited retirement from Shakespearean criticism. A complete escape from public censure, then and thereafter, will hardly be possible as their published opinions will remain, stored in countless books and catalogues, as permanent and incontrovertible witnesses from the past, and as perpetual reminders of the dangers of dogmatic literary criticism, and as a full justification of the caveat entered by Francis Bacon over three centuries ago touching the tradition of knowledge, where he notes that "the most corrected copies are commonly the least correct." How is it possible to judge of an author's aims and the implications in his works unless the character and identity of that author be known? This is particularly applicable to the *Plays of Shakespeare*, which are complementary to Bacon's acknowledged works and are, indeed, a part of his *Instauratio Magna*.



## BACON'S CIPHER SIGNATURES.

By COMYNS BEAUMONT.

(The problem of Bacon's Numerical Cipher has been discussed variously in the pages of *BACONIANA* of late. The greatest authority on the Numerical Cipher was, of course, the late Mr. Frank Woodward, who published in 1916 (in conjunction with his brother, Mr. Parker Woodward) his "Secret Shakespearean Seals," and in 1923 his "Francis Bacon's Cipher Signatures." Printed for private circulation, these valuable works are known to very few, but the Bacon Society is privileged by the courtesy of Mr. Sydney Woodward, to reproduce such facsimile plates and extracts from his father's works as may be considered desirable. With this article we publish four replicas.—EDITOR.)

**M**R. FRANK WOODWARD, who was undoubtedly the greatest authority on the subject of the Numerical Cipher, in his book, "Francis Bacon's Cipher Signatures," published privately in 1923, says in his introductory words that "Nothing would alter the existing belief that the Stratford player himself wrote the plays attributed to him, but *proof* that someone else did: only an indisputable Cipher or the actual discovery of the manuscripts of the plays, could, in my opinion, ever *settle* the question." Few will deny the accuracy of this contention.

Frank Woodward claimed moreover that by his elucidation of the Baconian numerical cipher signatures he had solved the question, for he had unravelled an indisputable cipher in his and others' opinion. He says (in the work cited), "I shall *prove* to you that the true author was Francis Bacon. Fortunately, Bacon put his signature in Cipher to every play that he wrote, but those Cipher Signatures can only be found in the original editions or facsimiles of them. . . . The finding of these Cipher Signatures seemed to follow a natural path, as though their author was, by a kind of inductive process, leading the searcher toward their discovery. . . ." He was referring to the Ciphers known as the Simple and the Kay.

Readers of *BACONIANA* are probably well acquainted with the Simple and Kay Ciphers but for the benefit of those who are not so informed it will be better to explain them. They were used by Bacon, who in his "Advancement of Learning" (1605 ed., p. 62) specifically mentions both:

"For Cyphars: they are commonly in Letters or Alphabets but may be in Wordes. The Kind of Cyphars (beside the SIMPLE Cyphars with Changes and intermixtures of nulles, and Non-significants) are many, according to the Nature or Rule of the infoulding: WHEELLE Cyphars, KAY Cyphars etc."

The Simple Numerical Cipher merely follows the order of the Alphabet, A=1, B=2, C=3, etc., recollecting always that in Elizabethan times the Alphabet comprised only 24 letters, I and J being the same letter, as also U and V. Thus Z signified 24.

The Kay Cipher, referred to by Bacon, was first identified by Mr. W. E. Clifton. Studying the Simple Cipher he reflected that the letter "K," the tenth letter, being the first to require two figures, presented difficulties in counting continuous figures, as some letters would require one figure and others two to express them. For instance, 1223 might mean A, B, B, C (Simple), or 12, 23 (Kay), meaning MY. He concluded that double numbers would be used for the first nine letters of the Alphabet, with 'K' the tenth. Research finally gave him the solution in two periodical works, the first "The Repertoire of Records," 1631, and the second, the well-known "Resuscitatio," 1671, by William Rawley, Bacon's secretary and chaplain (p. 17). I cannot enter into details of this discovery at this time but will do so if requested. Clifton found that the letter 'A' by the Kay System represented the figure 27, not 25. Thus the "Kay" Cipher emerged as follows:

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	W	X	Y	Z
27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24

Further to clarify the situation it may be well to set out in table form the various Numerical Cipher Signatures of Bacon and the Rosicrucians or Fra Rosi Crosse, with whom he was so intimately related.

						<i>Simple.</i>	<i>Kay.</i>
Bacon	(from 1579 to 1603)	..				33	111
F. Bacon	"	"	"	"	"	39	143
Fr. Bacon	"	"	"	"	"	56	160
Francis Bacon	"	"	"	"	"	100	282
Fr. Bacon, Kt.	(from 1603 to 1618)					85	189
Francis Bacon, Kt.	"	"	"	"	"	129	311
Francis Bacon, Knight	"	"	"	"	"	166	426
Fr. St. Alban	(from 1620 to 1626)					88	192
Francis St. Alban	"	"	"	"	"	132	314
FRA ROSI CROSSE	..	..	..	..	..	157	287

In Frank Woodward's earlier volume, "Secret Shakespearean Seals," prepared in conjunction with his brother, Parker Woodward, are given 73 full-page photo-facsimile plates, each with their numerical solution presented in detail. In his later volume, "Francis Bacon's Cipher Signatures," 72 such plates are included, from which the four shown in this issue appear. For the purpose of presenting the Woodward System we have selected the following: the 1623 Folio, "Heminge and Condell Letter"; the page containing "The Names of the Principall Actors"; The Catalogue, showing Rosicrucian Seals and the signature "F. Bacon"; and the same Catalogue again, showing Bacon in various signatures.

The reader may perhaps be reminded that fifteen of the plays included in the First Folio had not been published in any form whatsoever until seven years after William Shakspeare's death at Stratford-on-Avon. These were, "The Tempest," "Two Gentlemen of Verona," "Measure for Measure," "Comedy of Errors," "As You Like It," "All's Well that Ends Well," "Twelfth Night," "The Winter's Tale," "King Henry the Eighth," "Coriolanus," "Timon





No. 2. Print.

## To the great Variety of Readers.

6



From the most able, to him that can but spell: There you are number'd. We had rather you were weigh'd. Especially, when the fate of all Bookes depends vpon your capacities: and not of your heads alone, but of your purses. Well! It is now publike, & you will stand for your priuiledges wee know: to read, and censure. Do so, but buy it first. That doth best

11  
9  
6  
9  
11  
9  
11

commend a Booke, the Stationer saies. Then, how odde soeuer your braines be, or your wisdomes, make your licence the same, and spare not. Iudge your sixe-pen'orth, your shillings worth, your siue shillings worth at a time, or higher, so you rise to the iust rates, and welcome. But, what euer you do, Buy. Censure will not driue a Trade, or make the lacke go. And though you be a Magistrate of wit, and sit on the Stage at *Black-Friers*, or the *Cock-pit*, to arraigne Playes daile, know, these Playes haue had their triall alreadie, and stood out all Appales; and do now come forth quitted rather by a Decree of Court, then any purchas'd Letters of commendation.

11  
11  
18  
9  
11  
18  
11  
18  
12  
12  
18  
6

190

It had bene a thing, we confesse, worthie to haue bene wished, that the Author himselfe had liu'd to haue set forth, and ouerseen his owne writings; But since it hath bin ordain'd otherwise, and he by death departed from that right, we pray you do not envie his Friends, the office of their care, and paine, to haue collected & publish'd them; and so to haue publish'd them, as where (before) you were abus'd with diuerse stolne, and surreptitious copies, maimed, and deformed by the frauds, and stealthes of iniurious impostors, that expos'd them: euen those, are now offer'd to your view cur'd, and perfect of their limbes; and all the rest, absolute in their numbers, as he conceiued the. Who, as he was a happie imitator of Nature, was a most gentle expresser of it. His mind and hand went together: And what he thought, he vttered with that easinesse, that wee haue scarce receiued from him a blot in his papers. But it is not our province, who onely gather his works, and giue them you, to praise him. It is yours that reade him. And there we hope, to your diuers capacities, you will finde enough, both to draw, and hold you: for his wit can no more lie hid, then it could be lost. Reade him, therefore; and againe, and againe: And if then you doe not like him, surely you are in some manifest danger, not to vnderstand him. And so we leaue you to other of his Friends, whom if you need, can bee your guides: if you neede them not, you can leade your selues, and others. And such Readers we wish him.

18  
18  
18  
14  
14  
10  
10  
10  
14  
14  
14  
12  
18  
14  
14  
12  
16  
18  
18  
15  
18  
6

192

18

A 3

John Heminge.  
Henrie Condeell.

NO 1: THE HEMINGE AND CONDELL LETTER IS IN THE 1623 FOLIO, showing FR. ST. ALBAN IN KAY AND SIMPLX NUMERICAL CIPHER.

# The Workes of William Shakespeare,

containing all his Comedies, Histories, and  
Tragedies: Truely set forth, according to their first  
O R I G I N A L L.

## The Names of the Principall Actors in all these Playes.



William Shakespeare. 17	Samuel Gilburne. 14
Richard Burbadge. 15	Robert Armin. 11
John Hemmings. 12	William Ostler. 10
Augustine Phillips. 17	Nathan Field. 11
William Kempt. 12	John Underwood. 10
Thomas Poope. 11	Nicholas Tooley. 14
George Bryan. 11	William Ecclestone. 17
Henry Condell. 12	Joseph Taylor. 12
William Slye. 11	Robert Benfield. 14
Richard Cowly. 10	Robert Gougbe. 10
John Lowine. 11	Richard Robinson. 10
Samuell Crosse. 10	John Shancke. 11
Alexander Cooke. 12	John Rice. 8

Sum 167

Sum  
167

NO. 2: THE LIST OF ACTORS GIVING THE FIGURE OF 287, FRA ROSI  
CROSSE" AND III, "BACON," IN KAY CIPHER, NUMBER OF LETTERS  
IN THE HEADING.



of Athens," "Julius Cæsar," "Macbeth," "Antony and Cleopatra" and "Cymbeline." No vestige of the manuscripts of these is known to exist, nor did Shakspeare mention a word of them in his Will, although he remembered to bequeath his second best bed to his wife. Why did not this alleged genius, whose grasping qualities at Stratfort-on-Avon included a few shillings; add to his fame and wealth by putting them into print? The answer is, of course, as all Baconians are aware, that Shakspeare did not write a word of them, and Frank Woodward essays to prove by numerical evidence that they were the work of Francis Bacon.

Taking firstly the open letter of Heminge and Condell, on the second line are the words "You are number'd," so Frank Woodward was certain a Cipher count was there, but could not trace it until it occurred to him that this letter would be one of the last items to be written before going to press and that Bacon had then become Viscount St. Alban. The puzzle was solved, for the first section of the letter, Roman and Italic, consists of 192 words, or, "Fr. St. Alban" (Kay Cipher), followed by another count of 192 words and one other of 88, or "Fr. St. Alban" (Simple Cipher).

There is still another count concealed on this page in Woodward's estimation. If we count *all* the Italic letters, they total up to 69 and if these be added to the previous 88 ("Fr. St. Alban") the sum makes 157, the numerical value of "Fra Rosi Crosse" in Simple Cipher. Thus the Heminge and Condell Letter page can give us "Fra St. Alban" twice by Kay Cipher, "Fr. St. Alban" by Simple Cipher and "Fra Rosi Crosse" in the same.

Now we will glance at the second example—the List of Actors' page. Here Woodward added up all the letters totalling 332, a figure of no value. He then added up the letters comprising the words "The Names of the Principall Actors in all these Plays," namely 45. Deducting them from the 332, the answer was 287, otherwise "Fra Rosi Crosse" in Kay Cipher. Nor was this all. The 19 words in Roman letters at the top of the page, commencing with "The Workes" to "first" count up to 111 letters, signifying Bacon in Kay Cipher. The last word, namely "Originall," in Italic letters was not in the count, but the two capital W's being deliberately set up as double V's, count as two letters in each case.

Thence we turn to the most remarkable example of all. The Catalogue of the plays, in Frank Woodward's opinion, is the most wonderful thing in the whole Folio. He says of it, "Rather it should be called 'A Catalogue of Bacon's Cipher Signatures.' It has been arranged with the utmost ingenuity and should in itself convince most people that Francis Bacon himself drew it up." "As a Catalogue," he continues, "it is full of errors, for its accuracy has had to be sacrificed to the exigencies of the Cipher Signatures. Of the 35 plays enumerated, 25 fail to agree with the titles in the volume. Troylus and Cressida is omitted altogether and three of the Folio numbers are incorrect, the Merry Wives commences on p. 39 (not 38). Winter's Tale on p. 277 (not 304), and Antony and Cleopatra on p. 340

(not 346). As an example of the inaccuracy in description we find in the Catalogue "Cymbeline, King of Britaine" is headed "The Tragedie of Cymbeline" in the Folio.

This page is reproduced here in duplicate to illustrate the Cipher numbering. The first one enumerates the letters and adds up to 430. There is no such Cipher number, but when we deduct 287, the "Fra Rosi Crosse" Seal, the residue 143 is the Kay Cipher for "F. Bacon." In addition the first column totals 314 and that stands for "Francis St. Alban" in Kay Cipher. That, it may be admitted, is something to go on with, but it is only a beginning. The second enumeration of this page, shown as our fourth example, is even more surprising. The counts are so many that they require tabulation:

- (1) The Comedies contain 56 words—"Fr. Bacon" (Simple).
- (2) Italic Capitals, both columns, 111 letters—"Bacon" (Kay).  
(To obtain this result three words printed with Capitals in the Plays are shorn of them in the Catalogue, namely, "Richard the second," "Henry the fourth," twice.)
- (3) The Roman letters contain 100 letters—"Francis Bacon" (Simple).
- (4) Complete Italic words on Column 2, 100—"Francis Bacon" (Simple).

Added to the others already dealt with we find thus seven Separate Signatures, viz., Bacon, F. Bacon, Fr. Bacon, Francis Bacon (twice), Francis St. Alban and Fra Rosi Crosse. There is, in the opinion of Messrs. Frank and Parker Woodward, one other count giving again "Fra Rosi Crosse." It is a surprising and even an impish trick if Bacon did contrive it. The three words "Comedies, Histories, Tragedies" in the Catalogue, in Roman Capitals, by Simple Cipher amount in letters to 272, which is no Baconian number, but seeing the astounding mental acrobatics—I can think of no better description at the moment—which could contrive these seven totally different and varying numerical Ciphers from a commonplace-looking page of contents, the Woodward brothers felt that some use would be made for them in this conceit of seals. But 272! Then Parker Woodward noticed that the capital R in the word HISTORIES was peculiar, indeed, altogether strange.

That R had evidently been printed either with a broken type letter or a special letter had been cast which could serve either as a P or R. When submitted to a printer, he said it must have been cast specially. If it were intended to be used both as P and R, the latter letter would add 15 to 272, making 287—the *secret Cipher figure in Kay of the Fra Rosi Crosse*!

More might be said of this astonishing array of Baconian Cipher figures relating to the opening pages of the Folio of 1623. For instance the famous lines "To the Reader" signed "B.I." add up to 287 letters in Kay or Fra Rosi Crosse. The letters on the Droeshout Portrait page add up to 157, "Fra Rosi Crosse" in Simple. Ben Jonson's poem to "my beloved, the Author," contains 287 Italic words on the first page, "Fra Rosi Crosse" again, and 132 Roman letters, "Francis St. Alban" in Simple Cipher, while the heading, consisting of 17 words and 71 letters, totals 88, was "Fr. St. Alban" in Simple Cipher.





# A CATALOGVE

of the feuerall Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies contained in this Volume.

*Letters*

*Folios*

## COMEDIES.

1.	<b>H</b> e Tempest.	Folio 1.
2.	The two Gentlemen of Verona.	20
3.	The Merry Wives of Windsor	38
4.	Measure for Measure.	61
5.	The Comedy of Errors.	85
6.	Much adoo about Nothing.	101
7.	Loues Labour lost.	122
8.	Midsummer Nights Dreame.	145
9.	The Merchants of Venice.	163
10.	As you Like it	185
11.	The Taming of the Shrew.	208
12.	All is well, that Ends well.	230
13.	Twelve-Nights, or what you will.	255
14.	The Winters Tale.	304

## HISTORIES.

15.	The Life and Death of King John.	Folio 1.
16.	The Life & death of Richard the second.	23

The First part of King Henry the fourth.	46	1
The Second part of K. Henry the fourth.	74	29
The Life of King Henry the Fifth.	69	3
The First part of King Henry the Sixth.	96	4
The Second part of King Hen. the Sixth.	120	5
The Third part of King Henry the Sixth.	147	6
The Life & Death of Richard the Third.	173	7
The Life of King Henry the Eighth.	205	8

## TRAGEDIES.

The Tragedy of Coriolanus.	Folio 1.	92
Titus Andronicus.	31	10
Romeo and Juliet.	53	11
Timon of Athens.	80	12
The Life and death of Julius Caesar.	109	13
The Tragedy of Macbeth.	131	14
The Tragedy of Hamlet.	152	15
King Lear	183	16
Othello the Moore of Venice.	310	17
Anthony and Cleopatra.	346	18
Cymbeline King of Brittain	369	19

*See also "The Merry Wives of Windsor" and*

*287*

*289*

*290*

NO. 3. THE CATALOGUE, WITH LETTERS NUMBERING 130. REPRESENTING 287, "FRA ROS: CROSSE" AND 143, "F. BACON" IN KAY CIPHER. ALL THESE ARE REDUCED FACSIMILES FROM THE 1623 FOLIO



# A CATALOGVE

of the feuerall Comedies, Histories, and Tra-  
gedies contained in this Volume.

## COMEDIES.

2	2	<i>The Tempest.</i>	Folio 1.
al	al	<i>The two Gentlemen of Verona.</i>	20
~	al	<i>The Merry Wives of Windsor.</i>	38
~	~	<i>Measure for Measure.</i>	61
al	~	<i>The Comedy of Errors.</i>	85
~	~	<i>Much ado about Nothing.</i>	101
~	al	<i>Loves Labour lost.</i>	122
al	al	<i>Midsummer Nights Dreame.</i>	145
al	~	<i>The Merchant of Venice.</i>	163
~	~	<i>As you Like it.</i>	185
al	al	<i>The Taming of the Shrew.</i>	208
~	al	<i>All is well, that Ends well.</i>	230
~	al	<i>Twelfth-Night, or what you will.</i>	255
al	al	<i>The Winters Tale.</i>	304

## HISTORIES.

al		<i>The Life and Death of King Iohn.</i>	Folio 1.
al		<i>The Life &amp; death of Richard the second.</i>	23

<i>The First part of King Henry the fourth.</i>	46
<i>The Second part of K. Henry the fourth.</i>	74
<i>The Life of King Henry the Fifth.</i>	69
<i>The First part of King Henry the Sixth.</i>	96
<i>The Second part of King Hen. the Sixth.</i>	120
<i>The Third part of King Henry the Sixth.</i>	147
<i>The Life &amp; Death of Richard the Third.</i>	173
<i>The Life of King Henry the Eighth.</i>	205

## TRAGEDIES.

<i>The Tragedy of Coriolanus.</i>	Folio 1.
<i>Titus Andronicus.</i>	31
<i>Romco and Juliet.</i>	53
<i>Timon of Athens.</i>	80
<i>The Life and death of Julius Caesar.</i>	109
<i>The Tragedy of Macbeth.</i>	131
<i>The Tragedy of Hamlet.</i>	152
<i>King Lear.</i>	283
<i>Othello, the Moore of Venice.</i>	310
<i>Anthony and Cleopatra.</i>	346
<i>Cymbeline King of Brittain.</i>	369

NO. 4: THE CATALOGUE AGAIN, SHOWING 56, "FR. BACON," SIMPLE  
CIPHER, 100 TWICE, "FRANCIS BACON," SIMPLE, AND ITALIC CAPITALS  
III, "BACON" IN KAY.



Ben Jonson's second page totals 100 in Roman letters, "Francis Bacon" in Simple Cipher and 56 Roman letters, "Fr. Bacon" in Simple Cipher, while the Italic words number 314 (including Ben Jonson's name at the foot) which is "Francis St. Alban" in Kay Cipher. These pages are a maze of Cipher signatures to be understood by the initiated much as if Bacon had written his signature all over them.

So much, then, for these particular pages which have been selected from the wealth of material collected at great cost and industry by the late Mr. Frank Woodward, whom all Baconians should hold in reverence for his single-minded devotion to the cause of placing Francis Bacon on the highest pinnacle of fame due to him by every right. It should be understood that his elucidation of the Numerical Ciphers invented by Bacon and employed with such consummate skill cover a very wide field and if figures signify anything, it may be said that Frank Woodward was fully justified in claiming that he had proved Bacon to be Shakespeare. To achieve his aim Bacon made page after page, from a typographical point of view, inaccurate or eccentric.

It is impossible to argue, as some may, that such figures as those produced were contrived by jugglery on the part of Frank Woodward, or, alternatively, that they are a coincidence. No-one in their senses, or at any rate with a grain of logic, can pretend that figures like 33, 56, 100, 111, 157, 287, and so on, not many all told, in fact only 20, including both the Simple and Kay Ciphers, could have been a sequence of flukes and deny that nearly all, if not every play, is signed at the end by Bacon by one or other of these numbers. Other examples give exactly the same message as in those published here, namely, that Francis Bacon was the immortal author of these works, which include Spenser and other names associated with him. The Numerical Cipher, Simple and Kay, is almost easy enough for a schoolboy to handle accurately, although, of course, Bacon concealed it in various ways so as to avoid exposure in his own lifetime. The decipherer had to discover whether the sum total of a page or column were to be added to the heading or some other feature, or whether it were to be deducted, and so on. Like all ciphers, it would have defeated its own object had it been obvious to everybody.

## A CONCORDANCE TO BACON'S WORKS.

By ARTHUR CONSTANCE.

POPE'S reference to Bacon as "the wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind" has been misunderstood for several centuries, and applied (with malicious injustice) to the latter, by polemic Stratford-on-Avonites, because of the scarcity of concordances to famous authors: a reason which is emphasised rather than minimised by the neglect of such concordances as have been available.

For reference to Abbott's Concordance to Pope shows us that the caustic poet used the word "meanest" six times, and six times only, in his writings; and that—although we might *a priori* expect Pope to apply such a forceful adjective (somewhere or other) in the worst sense of the word "meanest," yet in actual fact he never uses it to mean anything but "humble" or "lowly." Here is positive proof of this fact—so vital to the vindication of Bacon in the usage of the "wisest, brightest, meanest" quotation—in the shape of the six usages of "meanest" to which I have referred: comprehending, mark you, *all* Pope's usages of this adjective:

Nor past the meanest unregarded. . . . *Dunciad*, IV, 575.

Or deeming meanest what we greatest call. . . . *Epistle to Harley*, 19.

The last, the meanest, of your sons inspire. . . . *Essay on Criticism*, 196.

He dreads a death-bed like the meanest slave. . . . *Ep. I to Cobham*, 116.

And what is Fame? the Meanest have their Day. . . . *Sat. IV, from Hor. Ep. I*, vi, 46.

And, of course:

The wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind. . . . *Essay on Man*, IV, 282.

As it is quite obvious that Pope uses "meanest"—in accordance with common understanding of the word in those days—to signify meek, unpretentious, and all that is the opposite of "proud"—there can be no ambiguity regarding his reference to Bacon: even if any were possible when we note that the quotation in question pivots upon the phrase in the previous line, "think how Bacon shined."

Leopards do not change their spots, nor William worshippers their positions, so we must not expect any admissions of their mis-handlings of this Pope quotation from the stubborn opponents of Baconian truth—in fact we may well find them meanly using this meanest phrase, in its unjustifiable meaning, more than ever.

But the lesson remains for all who reverence the greatest genius of all time: *Use your concordances.*

Well, how many are available to students of English literature?

I have been seeking the answer to this pertinent question for many years—in fact for the best part of a literary lifetime. Realising,



for more than thirty years, that concordances have very special value to the student who wants to do as Dr. Routh, then Fellow of Oriel College—and not Gladstone, as often misstated—advised, namely, “Verify your quotations”—realising this, I have laboriously collected them. My shelves now hold concordances to Shakespeare (of course—but including rarer ones), Burns, Shelley, Tennyson, Cowper, Spenser, Chaucer, Wordsworth, Milton, Gray and dozens of others—in fact 53 such reference works to date, including such unusual ones as one to a Kempis and another to Fitzgerald’s Omar Khayyam.

All these—covering, one might say, the main figures in English literature—yet none to Bacon!

*No concordance to Francis Bacon.*

Truly the wisest, truly the brightest—for what genius among humans has so enlightened the mind of man?—truly the *humblest* of all English authors. Here let me say in parenthesis that I should be no lover of Bacon if I gave any of these facts about my library in any spirit of pride—they are given to emphasise the incongruity of the present position: to drive home the urgent need of a concordance to the works of one who—more than all English writers—assuredly deserves one.

*No concordance to Bacon*—plenty of books about him. A spate of spiteful books in the centuries immediately following his passing—a spate which has now diminished to a mere trickle (though the water is none-the-less dirty) as adverse criticism of him has evaporated with the rising of the Sun of Truth. Plenty of books praising him, explaining him, even analysing him—of which I have a mere 200 of the vast total—but no concordance.

Surely the time has come to do something about it. Surely there is no more vital need at this moment, in those fields of literary research which are irrigated and enriched by the purer streams of Baconian philosophy, than this one implement, with which all such fields may be far more adequately ploughed and planted—a concordance to Bacon.

How our knowledge of him—our reading of him, our understanding of him—would immediately profit by such a work!

How much more efficiently would our case, as Baconians, be presented, with such a work to hand for quick and easy reference!

The making of a concordance to any author’s works is no easy matter. *Vide* Mrs. Cowden Clarke’s long and prodigious labours with that section of Bacon’s writings misappropriated by the wanton William.

One at least of my concordances bears silent and tragic witness to the stupendous nature of any such task. It is John Neve’s concordance to the poetical works of William Cowper. A fine and conscientious work—but it stops short at the word “THUNDER”—Neve had not completed it when he died. “Not much more to do,” one might think—yet “Oh, the little more, and how much it is! And the little less, and what worlds away!”

A year or so more, a renewing of his earlier youth, more time, more worry, more zeal—and numbers of literary students following

Neve might have benefited by having all Cowper's usages of such words as "time," "worry," "year," "youth," and "zeal" *instantly* available to them.

To produce a concordance to Bacon would require the traditional characteristic of genius—the capacity to take infinite pains. It would require money—less, of course, if a publisher could be interested in advance, but in any case considerable expense on the part of those undertaking the task. But all labour and expense would truly be justified in this instance, and we who have Bacon's integrity and genius at heart should surely do anything we can about it.

I suggest that we should immediately examine ourselves, to discover what we can do in this matter, and for this purpose I hope the editor will permit the insertion of this simple questionnaire, to which I earnestly hope all interested will reply. I should like to take your answers to these questions and deal with them in another article, in which I may, with your kind permission, indicate the practical possibilities of producing and publishing a concordance to Bacon, while giving you fuller details of the nature of the task and all it implies. Will you therefore complete this little questionnaire, insofar as it applies to yourself—sending it when completed (or the material information in letter form, if you do not wish to mutilate this copy of BACONIANA) to me, care of the Editor.

### QUESTIONNAIRE.

#### A CONCORDANCE TO BACON.

1. Are you prepared, with the needed facilities, to undertake such a concordance, based on Spedding? .....
2. If not, are you prepared to collaborate with others in the production of such a work—which may take several years—on a voluntary basis? .....
3. If prepared to collaborate, approximately what time per week, on the average, could you guarantee? .....
4. If unable to give actual work to the production of this concordance, are you prepared to help financially? .....
5. By regular periodical payments—please state how much and at what intervals? .....
6. By one single contribution—of how much, please? .....
7. If indisposed to make any such contributions, would you guarantee to purchase a copy when published, at a figure not exceeding five pounds? .....
8. If prepared to become a subscriber in the sense of the last question, are you prepared to pay, say, one pound in advance, which would ensure you a copy, the balance being payable on publication? .....
9. If a publisher, or in a position to supply help in printing or publishing, please indicate on what terms? .....

## "ENDIMION."

### AN INTERPRETATION.

By R. L. EAGLE.

THIS court comedy, attributed to John Lilly (though not published under his name), was first printed in 1591, and is stated on the title-page as having been "played before the Queens Majestie at Greenewich on New Yeeres day at night." It is an extremely youthful composition. The style, exuberance and general characteristics of the piece proclaim it as the offspring of a genius and scholar not more than twenty years of age. As John Lilly, or Lyly, became a student at Magdalen, Oxford, in 1569, and as the date of his birth was 1553-4, it would, therefore, be necessary to date the play as not later than 1573, if he wrote it. There was, however, no English language at that early date which would have made the vocabulary used in the writing of the play possible. It belongs to the period 1580-1587.

It is impossible to believe, too, that such a work was born of him whom Gabriel Harvey in *Pierce's Supererogation* (1593) described thus :

"He hath not played the Vicemaster of Poules, and the Foolemaster of the Theatre for naughtes : himself a mad lad as ever twanged ; never troubled with any substance of witt, or circumstance of honestie, sometime the fiddle-sticke of Oxford, now the very bable of London."

Nashe in *Have with you to Saffron Walden* (1596) refers to Harvey's attack adding that Lilly spent much time "in taking Tobacco."

F. W. Fairholt, the editor of Lilly's plays, published in two volumes in 1858, asks, "Who was the person who sat for the picture of Endimion?" He agrees that Cynthia is Queen Elizabeth—the "mortal moon," and the Diana of the Elizabethan poets. A careful reading of the play leaves no doubt, in view of our present knowledge which was denied to Fairholt, that Endimion represents young Francis Bacon.

In the opening speech, he says to Eumenides, "My thoughts are stitched to the stars which, being as high as I can see, thou mai'st imagine how much higher they are than I can reach." Now Bacon called his philosophical method a ladder (*Scala Intellectus*), and declared that every inquirer after truth must mount it step by step to the top.

In the play, Endimion is in love (for duty and service) with Cynthia. Tellus, who represents worldly fortune (her original is, of course, the goddess of earthly riches and increase) tries to entice him away from Cynthia, who, though outwardly representing Elizabeth, is allegorically the personification of his philosophy, for which he



had "vast contemplative ends." Eumenides, at the end of the scene, speaks of Endimion as "a man of such rare virtues"—a tribute which was endorsed by those who were Bacon's friends, such as Sir Tobie Mathew and Ben Jonson. In the next scene (1-2), we hear about "the greatness of his *mind*, being affected with a thing *more than mortal*." As early as 1579, when Bacon was 18, Hillyard had placed Latin words around his (Bacon's) portrait meaning, "If only his *mind* could be painted!" Bacon's mind was, as we know from his own declaration, fixed upon posterity:

"I write for posterity, these things requiring ages for their accomplishment."

*Letter to Father Fulgentio.*

Shakespeare, in Sonnet 125, says he has "laid great bases for eternity."

From the remarks of Tellus in this scene, we learn further that he was comely; had a "sharp wit," and that he wrote sonnets. Moreover, that he is, "one that all the world wondreth at." This is undoubtedly true of Bacon, and Bacon alone, who was described as "the observation of great and wise men; and afterwards the *wonder* of all." (*Lives of the Statesmen and Favourites of Queen Elizabeth.*) There is much contemporary evidence and testimony to the same effect, for, as his Chaplain, Dr. Rawley, observed, he was "the glory of his age and nation, the adorning and ornament of learning."

Having failed with her allurements to tempt Endimion from Cynthia, Tellus enlists the services of the enchantress, Dipsas. It is the same allegorical story as we find in the Shakespeare Sonnets of the allurements of the "dark lady" (Fortune) charming temporarily the poet's "better part" (his Philosophy or Muse).

The next revealing scene in the first in Act II. Endimion exclaims, in the opening soliloquy:

"O fair Cynthia! O unfortunate Endimion! Why was not both thy birth as high as thy thoughts, or her beauty less than *heavenly*? or why are not thine honours as rare as her beauty? or thy fortunes as great as thy deserts?"

Queen Elizabeth would have lapped up this flattery, but she would not have understood that the author was thinking of his own intellectual soul—his philosophy and poesy which, as he says in *The Advancement of Learning* "was ever thought to have some participation of *divineness*." "Much is the force of *heaven-bred poesy*." (*Two Gentlemen of Verona*, III, 2.) Endimion's lament is repeated in several of the Shakespeare Sonnets, especially 25, 91 and 111:

Let those that are in favour with their stars,  
Of public honour and proud titles boast,  
Whilst I whom fortune of such triumph bars  
Unlook'd for joy in that I honour most.

Some glory in their birth, some in their skill,  
Some in their wealth, some in their bodies' force,  
Some in their garments, though new-fangled ill,  
Some in their hawks and hounds, some in their horse.

Thy love is better than high birth to me,  
Richer than wealth &c.

O, for my sake do you with Fortune chide,  
The guilty goddess of my harmful deeds,  
That did not better for my life provide  
Than public means which public manners breeds.

There is no mistaking Bacon in :

"Remember my solitary life, almost these seven years. Whom have I entertained but mine own thoughts, and thy (Cynthia's) virtues? What company have I used but contemplation? . . . Have I not spent my golden years in hopes, waxing old with wishing?"

Bacon's seven years of solitary life began in 1579. We get, therefore, approximately 1586 for the writing of the play, which agrees with the authorities, so far as they have been able to estimate.

It is absurd to attempt to apply it to "the mad lad" and the vicemaster of Poules." Spedding finds that Bacon was "confined to his readings and exercises in Gray's Inn . . . his head was full of ideas so new and so large that to most about him they must have seemed visionary." During the whole of this period he was in money difficulties. Like Anaxagoras, to whom in a letter he referred, he had "reduced himself with contemplation unto voluntary poverty." It was not so much the contemplation, but the printing and publishing of its fruits which plunged him into debt. All these years he was, like Endimion, "waxing old with wishing," for, as he wrote to Burleigh (when impatient because, like Hamlet, he "lacked advancement,") "I do now wax somewhat ancient; one-and-thirty years is a great deal of sand in the hour-glass."

Endimion speaks of himself as "divorcing himself from the amiableness of all ladies, the bravery of all courts, the company of all men," and that he had "chosen in a solitary cell to live." It was Spenser's "pleasant Willy"—

. . . the man whom Nature selfe had made  
To mocke herself and truth to imitate,  
and who:  
Doth rather choosè to sit in idle cell.

*Teares of the Muses (1591).*

While Endimion sleeps (II, 3), the enchantress, Dipsas, appears on the scene. She has been engaged by Tellus to cast a spell under

which Endimion will sleep for ever. From her we learn that he had "golden locks," and that on his chin, "scarcely appeareth soft down." This is in keeping with the Hillyard miniature of Bacon at the age of eighteen.

Queen Cynthia hears of this, and his friend Eumenides is despatched to the enchanters of Thessaly for the counter-charm. He is informed that a kiss from Cynthia will restore Endimion, and that he will then resume his love and service. In the meantime, we have reference to him as "the wonder of all men . . . whose ripe years foretell rare virtues and whose unmellowed conceits promise rich counsel"—all of which were true of Bacon at that time. Several scenes follow which are not of any consequence for the purpose of this article, as the opportunity is taken for the minor characters in the secondary plot to strut "their weary hour upon the stage." We turn, therefore, to the final scene for further revelations and confirmation as to the identity of Endimion.

The enchantress, Dipsas, seems to represent Mary, Queen of Scots, who was executed in 1587 for complicity in one of the several plots to dethrone Elizabeth and put Mary on the throne. Cynthia charges her with having "practised that detested witchcraft," and with having "threatened to turn my course awry, and alter by thy damnable art the government that I now possess."

As for the "young, wise, honourable and virtuous Endimion," he is, says Cynthia, "the flower of my court, and the hope of succeeding time." He is vowed "to a service from which death cannot remove him."\* Of what nature could such service be? It could only be in the handing down of those special gifts of intellect in prose and verse. It is that immortality claimed for himself by the author of the Shakespeare sonnets. It was for posterity that Bacon worked. He was justified in writing, towards the end of his mortal life that he had "procured the good of all men."

Professor R. W. Chambers observes in *Man's Unconquerable Mind* (Jonathan Cape 1939):

"Verbal echoes are not to be neglected, least of all when they are connected with a real image in the writer's mind."

Those irresponsible "authorities" who lightly scoff at Bacon-Shakespeare parallelisms might take notice of this, though I do not think it likely. I wonder, however, if Professor Chambers will be correspondingly impressed with Dr. Melsome's *Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy*, which is packed with "verbal echoes" allied to images in the mind of Bacon and Shakespeare?

I have not space to demonstrate the countless parallelisms of the kind admitted by Professor Chambers which are to be found between the writings of Lilly, Bacon and Shakespeare. Such as:

\* Then happy I, that love and am belov'd,  
Where I may not remove, nor be remov'd.  
*Sonnet 25.*



Stars are to be looked at, not reached at.

*Campaspe*, III, 5.

Wilt thou reach stars, because they smile on thee?

*Two Gentlemen*, III, 1.

Fairholt points out many such passages, and says, "Such and many resemblances could not be accidental."

Lilly's comedies also contain the germs and origins of several characters and sequences of dialogue, particularly in the lighter scenes of *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Love's Labour's Lost* and *Merry Wives of Windsor*.

From the braggart, Sir Tophas, and his page Epiton, were evolved Don Adriano and Moth. The Constable and Watch (IV, 2) developed into Dogberry and the Watch. The Fairies (IV, 3), with their dance and their song:

Pinch him, pinch him, black and blue,  
Saucy mortals must not view &c.

is not much altered in the final scene of *The Merry Wives*. In philosophical mood, we find Lilly writing:

We silly souls are only *plodders* at *ergo*, whose wits are clasped up in our *books*, and so full of learning are we at home that we scarce know good manners when we come abroad. Cunning in nothing but in making small things great by figures, pulling on with the sweat of our studies a great shoe upon a little foot, *burning out one candle in seeking for another*, raw worldlings in matters of substance, passing wranglers about *shadows*.

*Sapho and Phao* (I, 3).\*

Bacon was likewise awake to these pedantic follies, and in *The Advancement of Learning*, mentioned "three distempers of learning; effeminate learning; contentious learning and fantastical learning." Coming to fruitless speculations," he not only agreed with "the middlestick of Oxford," but followed Lilly with the illustration of the burning candle:

For were it not better for a man in a fair room to set up one great light . . . than to go about with a small *watchcandle* into every corner? And such is their method that rests not so much upon evidence of truth . . . as upon particular confutations and solutions of every scruple, cavillation and objection; breeding for the most part one question as fast as it solveth another, even as in the former semblance when you carry the light into one corner *you darken the rest*."

Apart from the antithesis of the candle and the shadows in both these extracts, note the similarity in idea between Lilly's "pulling on with the sweat of our studies," etc., and Shakespeare's:

\* I hope to deal with *Sapho and Phao* in a subsequent article.

He *draweth out* the thread of his verbosity finer than the staple of his argument. I abhor such *fantastical* phantasms.  
*Love's Labour's Lost* (V, 1.)

We have already seen what Bacon thought of "fantastical learning." It was a pedant to whom Shakespeare was referring, and he suffered from the third of Bacon's "distempers of learning." Moreover Lilly's "plodders at ergo" are echoed in Shakespeare's:

Small have continual *plodders* ever won  
 Save base authority from others' *books*.

It was Bacon's chaplain, Dr. Rawley, who declared in his brief and guarded life of Bacon:

His lordship had not his knowledge from *books*, but from some grounds or notions from within himself. He was *no plodder upon books*.

If further evidence is required that Lilly, Bacon and Shakespeare were, in fact, three names but the same man, the works published under those names will provide it generously.

## MALVOLIO'S CRYPTIC WORD M.O.A.I.

By EDWARD D. JOHNSON

**I**N the October issue of "Baconiana" (p. 144) is a paragraph containing a most interesting suggestion as to the meaning of M.O.A.I. The M.O.A.I. puzzle seems to be worthy of some further study.

Here is the text of the passage containing M.O.A.I.:

"I may command where I adore, but silence like a Lucrese Knife  
 With bloodlesse stroke my heart doth gore, M.O.A.I. doth  
 sway my life  
*A fustian riddle*" (Twelfth Night, Act II, scene 3.)

The words *bloodless stroke* in the text show that the knife piercing the heart does not draw blood, so it is not a human heart, but the heart or inner part of something else, and as we are given the cryptic letters M.O.A.I., which are the letters at the beginning and end of the word Malvolio, it would seem that the riddle is contained in the name Malvolio.

The first two and last two letters in Malvolio are M.A.I.O., but the letters in the text are M.O.A.I. But, if we take M.O.A.I. and reverse the A and O we get M.A.O.I. If we then reverse the I and O we get M.A.I.O., the first two and last two letters in Malvolio. This prin

ciple of *reverse* is used constantly throughout the First Folio, and to give his readers a hint Francis Bacon reversed the number of the last page in the Folio, giving it the number 993, the reverse of its correct number 399.

M.O.A.I. is found on page 264 in the Comedies, and this page is the *reverse* page 40—that is to say, it is the 40th page counting backwards from the last page in the Comedies.

The words "my heart" and M.O.A.I. are found on the 8th line down the 1st column of the *reverse* page 40 in the Comedies. The 8th line up the 1st column of the *reverse* page 40 (page numbered 193) in the Histories with the line above it are :

"That my pent up *heart* may have some scope to beat  
Ah *cut* my lace *asunder*."

The 8th line down the 1st column of the *reverse* page 40 (page numbered 360) in the Tragedies is :

"Go, Eros, send his Treasure after—*do it*."

The 8th line down the 1st column of *page* 40 in the Tragedies is :

"He would have dropt his *knife* and fell asleepe."

Here on lines which bear the same numbers in the first columns of pages which bear or represent the same number we find the words M.O.A.I., *Heart, Heart, cut, asunder, do it, knife*.

A hint is therefore given to the reader to take a knife and cut asunder the heart of the word Malvolio and see what happens. By cutting away from Malvolio the first two and last two letters (M O A I) we find that the simple seal or count of the remaining letters L V O L (the heart of the word) is 56, and 56 is also the simple seal or count of FR. BACON. If we go a step further and cut off the first and last letters in L V O L we get L L. L is the roman numeral for 50, L L = 50 + 50, = 100, and 100 is the simple seal or count of Francis Bacon.

Who is telling us to cut up the word Malvolio? It is Bacon, because we see that the words "cut asunder" are on the 9th line up the 1st column of the reverse page 40 in the Histories. This is the page numbered 193 in the Histories. In the 1st column of the true page 193 (numbered 301) in the Tragedies, the 1st letters on the 9th, 10th and 11th lines down the column are C O, A N, B. This page numbered 193 in the Histories is the true page 225. The 9th line up the 1st column of the reverse page 225 (numbered 79) in the Comedies is "It shall be speeded well." This is an inner line; the first letters on the lines in the margin are CO, B, AN.

Returning to the M.O.A.I. puzzle; it will be seen that the first 3 letters on the third line of the text are WIT. The marginal word WIT is found a great number of times in the First Folio, and first appears in the margin of "The Address to the Reader" on the first page. If we count the letters in the text we find 50 letters to the word WIT and 50 letters after WIT. 50 + 50 = 100 = Francis



Bacon. The word WIT is in the heart of middle of the text. If we add the 3 letters in WIT to the 100 letters (Francis Bacon) we get 103 letters (all the letters in the text), and 103 is the simple seal or count of Shakespeare. The simple seal or count of the word WIT is 49. The 49th letter counting from the beginning of the text is F (in the word knife), and the 49th letter counting from the end of the text is B (in the word Bloodlesse). This accounts for the fact that Lucrece is spelt Lucresse, because an extra letter is required to make the F the 49th letter from the beginning to agree with the B the 49th letter from the end of the text. We are told that it is SILENCE which gores (pierces) the heart. The simple seal or count of the word SILENCE is 64, and 64 added to 36 the simple seal or count of M O A I gives 100 = Francis Bacon.

To sum up :—

1. We are told that the fustian riddle is contained in the word Malvolio.
2. We are told how to turn M O A I into M A I O.
3. We are told to take a knife and cut up the word Malvolio.
4. By cutting up Malvolio we find FR BACON and FRANCIS BACON.
5. By counting the letters in the text we find Francis Bacon, WIT, and Shakespeare.
6. The word WIT gives us F B.
7. The word Silence with M O A I gives us Francis Bacon.

If it is suggested that all the above deductions are coincidences, the answer is that it is an impossibility that eight different coincidences can be found in only four lines of the text.

Referring to Francis Bacon, Macaulay wrote, "In wit, if by wit be meant the power of perceiving analogies between things which appear to have nothing in common, he never had an equal." Francis Bacon was the world's greatest jester, and he had the power of making letters and figures dance to any tune he thought fit to call. The examples here shown are not isolated ones; there are dozens of similar examples in the First Folio of the "Shakespeare" Plays.

## "THE BACON—SHAKESPEARE ANATOMY."

### A Review of Dr. Melsome's Posthumous Work.<sup>1</sup>

THE late Dr. Melsome has made a valuable contribution to the important study of the long-standing Bacon-Shakespeare controversy—important because, not only is a question of Authorship involved, but also the weighty matter of the right understanding of the works of the Philosopher and the Dramatist is concerned herein: the prose philosophy of Bacon and the poetical philosophy of Shakespeare are complementary, each explains the other: they are as necessary to one another as the proton and neutron in the atom.

In his Introduction Dr. Melsome asks:—

"How shall we discover the mind of Bacon and show that it is also the Shakespeare mind?"

Ben Jonson in his *Discoveries* pertinently observes:—

"There cannot be one colour of the mind, another of the wit."

Samuel Taylor Coleridge enforces the connection between great poetry and philosophy when he writes:—

"No man was ever a great poet, without being at the same time a profound philosopher: for poetry is the blossom and fragrant of all human knowledge, human thoughts, human passions, emotions, language."

Archbishop Tenison writes in *Baconiana* (1679), when he published some manuscripts of Bacon which had not until then been printed:—

"And those who have true skill in the works of The Lord Verulam, like great masters of painting, can tell by the design, the way of colouring, whether he was the author of this or the other piece, though his name be not on it."

It is exactly in pursuance of this method that Dr. Melsome handles his subject, and he was well qualified for the task of comparison between the philosophic works of Bacon and the dramatic works of Shakespeare, as he possessed a great knowledge of both, and was endowed with a phenomenal memory.

Thus equipped he was peculiarly suited to demonstrate the similarities that exist between the two writers.

Without a proper knowledge and understanding of both authors any would-be critic or commentator is hopelessly at sea; without these qualifications a just appreciation of each author becomes

<sup>1</sup> *The Bacon-Shakespeare Anatomy*, by W. S. Melsome, M.A., M.D., F.R.C.S., etc., sometime Fellow of Queens' College, Cambridge, late President of the Bacon Society. (Lapworth & Co., Ltd., London, W.C.1., price 15/- net.)

impossible. Dr. Melsome's book is, as might be expected from one of his scientific training, conceived in a severely logical spirit and his inquiry is conducted in a manner that Francis Bacon would have approved; he has applied the inductive method in the investigation of authorship; indeed, he says in his Introduction, "My method is Baconian." In his Introduction the author says, with truth, that he has entered into the labours of collectors of ideas, opinions and expressions, common to both Bacon and Shakespeare; these have been gathered by the patient industry of several generations of Baconians from hundreds of obscure hiding-places in libraries and manuscript collections so that the facts may be brought together into a single unit of demonstrated truth, and like the rays of light gathered by an aplanatic mirror focussed upon the true author, thus illuminating the minds of men hitherto darkened and obscured by the great Shakespeare illusion. By comparing these similarities he has been able to show that an identity of thought and expression pervaded the work of both authors to such an extent that the only possible explanation can be that these proceeded from one individual—Francis Bacon, or that they copied one from the other, though in some cases this would not have been possible for Shakespeare owing to the fact that certain works of Bacon were not published till after the poet's death.

In order to demonstrate a conclusion in a matter of this sort there are two desiderata:—

- (1) Facts must be collected exhaustively;
- (2) Facts must be arranged critically.

Both these requirements have been amply fulfilled by the author.

It occurred to the reviewer in looking at Chapter I, Part I, that Dr. Melsome had omitted a Shakespeare parallelism as applicable to the first quotation from Bacon in that chapter:

"Dead flies cause to stinke and putrifie the ointment of the apoticarie; so doth a little folie him that is in estimation for wisdom and glory."

On looking at the Index, however, the writer was gratified to find the quotation he had in mind from the Sonnets (94):

"For sweetest things turn sourest by their deeds  
Lilies that fester, smell far worse than weeds"

more appropriately matched with Bacon's:

"And as eminent men take corruption from a particular fault, and the best men are in their corruption worst, so it is a principle in nature that the best things are in their corruption the worst, and the sweetest wine makes the sharpest vinegar"

(Life V, p. 313).

This book is a remarkable demonstration of how Bacon is echoed by Shakespeare and *vice versa* in their respective works, but remark-



able as their numerous instances of similarity are, the reader will be more surprised to find that both authors *misquote* Aristotle in practically the same terms ; Bacon says :—" Is not the opinion of Aristotle wise and worthy of regard, that young men are no fit auditors of moral philosophy, because the boiling heat of their affections is not tempered with time and experience,"—*De Augmentis* (Bk. VII, Chap. III).

Shakespeare's version of this is :—

" Not much unlike young men, whom Aristotle thought unfit to hear moral philosophy " (*Troilus* II, 2).

Dr. Melsome observes : " Right or wrong, Bacon and ' Shakespeare ' always think alike, and they were both keen students of Aristotle," by which the author of the book under review implies that both authors *misquote* Aristotle who talks of *political* and not *moral* philosophy in this particular passage.

To give many instances in this review of the author's felicity in adducing these similarities in sense and style would be but to reproduce the book, which must not only be tasted but swallowed, chewed and digested to be properly appreciated. Dr. Melsome quite properly takes Professor Dowden to task for not reading Bacon with sufficient attention (pp. 197-199) : on the last named page he notes what confusion the Professor makes of the "*dram of eale*" (*Hamlet*, I, 4) which, if he had read Bacon's *De Augmentis Scientiarum* (VIII, II parabola XI), he would have seen that this passage was intended to be a modified form of Ecclesiastes (X, 1). The Doctor notes that Professor Dowden would have us substitute "out-growths" for "excrements" in the passage :—

" Your bedded hair, like life in excrements,  
Start up and stand on end (*Hamlet*, III, 4)."

If the Professor had turned to *Sylva Sylvarum* he would have noted Bacon's experiments with excrements, and if he had realised the identity of the two (or one) author he would have appreciated that no emendation was necessary.

The implied contention of Dr. Melsome is that if the works of Bacon were consulted, Shakespearean critics would avoid many pitfalls ; as it is, for want of this precaution many fall into strange errors and a text which they do not understand will be stigmatised as corrupt ; nothing is more attractive to the fraternity of Commentators than a so-called " corrupt text " ; here is an opportunity for displaying their exegetical ingenuity and at the same time drawing out the thread of their verbosity longer than the staple of their argument, and thus by an infinite agitation of wit, producing those cobwebs of learning so much derided by Francis Bacon, " admirable for the fineness of the thread, but of no substance or profit " ; and so for want of a proper knowledge of Bacon to use as a gloss on the works of Shakespeare, the Quartos and First Folio are led to the corrective shambles and butchered to make a Commentator's holiday !

Thus scholarly verbalism has obscured the original meanings : if this textual vivisection is allowed to continue unchecked for a few more centuries the Shakespeare Canon will have been so emasculated, bowdlerised, emended and corrected that little of it will be left as it was originally written, to the great loss of the general reading public who are not interested in what critics *think* Shakespeare should have written, or intended, but rather in what he did in fact write.

Until the critics realise who Shakespeare was there seems little remedy for this unhappy state of affairs, except by a return to the original text by means of printing facsimiles of the Quartos and First Folio : without a retention of the uncorrected text a proper illuminating comparison between Bacon's and Shakespeare's works would be rendered wholly nugatory.

It is against this ignorant corrective zeal that Dr. Melsome raises an oft-repeated protest and thus does good service to the cause of truth.

How shall they Shakespeare understand who only Shakespeare know ?

This book contains a reproduction of the outer leaf of the Northumberland Manuscript which was discovered in 1867 during the demolition of Northumberland House, in the Strand ; Bacon's and Shakespeare's names occur in association on it, in addition to the titles of four orations written by Bacon about 1591, and intended for a masque.

In addition there is a photostat of part of the manuscript of the play of *Sir Thomas More*, which some scholars believe to have been written by Shakespeare, and inserted in that manuscript by him ; experts are divided as to the identity of the hand : the present writer, having seen the manuscript in question in the M.S. Department of the British Museum, and having compared it with a letter of Bacon's to Lord Puckering, came to the conclusion that there was a distinct resemblance between the two,—but the reviewer does not profess to be an expert in handwriting, and where experts disagree doubt must remain and judgment be suspended. Dr. Melsome's contribution to this immense subject is calculated to become one of the literary bases from which the more belligerent Baconians will sally forth to attack the crumbling citadel of the Shakespearean Myth, which in the fulness of time is destined to fade like an insubstantial pageant and leave not a rack behind.

The " Anatomy " in fact will become indispensable to all future Shakespearean commentary and criticism. It is well produced and printed under the editorship of Mr. Roderick L. Eagle, who has written a short introduction. Not the least important of features are two very comprehensive indexes, occupying 26 pages in all, which will prove a great boon in facilitating research.

W. G. C. G.

## CRANFIELD—A BASE ACCUSER.

**P**LAUTUS wrote, "He who accuses another man of shameful conduct should take care to keep himself blameless." When reading James Howell's *Familiar Letters* (published by Dent in 3 volumes), I came to a reference to Lionel Cranfield, later Earl of Middlesex, in a letter written by Howell on 19th March, 1621, addressed to his father. Howell says, "Cranfield grows very powerful, but the city hates him for having betrayed their greatest secrets, which he was capable to know more than another, having been formerly a merchant." This grievance appears to refer to the appropriation of monopolies from trade to the Crown, thence to be bestowed upon favourites or bought by the wealthy for private exploitation. In this way, James found money for his extravagances and his favourites. Bacon was opposed to these monopolies in and out of Parliament. In his Letter of Advice to Villiers (Buckingham) he wrote:—

"But especially, care must be taken that monopolies, which are the cankers of all trading, be not admitted under specious colours of public good."

Cranfield had been a mercer in the City, and a member of the Company of Mercers.

Howell, writing on 11th December, 1625, to his father, again mentions Cranfield's betrayal of his former fellow-tradesmen. King James had just died and, says Howell:—

"There are great preparations for the funeral, and there is a design to buy all the cloth for mourning *white* and then to be put to the dyers in gross, which is like to save the crown a good deal of money; the drapers murmur extremely at the Lord Cranfield for it."

Cranfield was the chief of the conspirators, under Sir Edward Coke, who sought the fall of Lord Chancellor Bacon. He was born in 1575, his father being a small tradesman in London. Like Buckingham, he was gifted with good looks and undoubted abilities, both of which he was determined to use as a means of advancement. His opportunity came when he secured the favour of the Earl of Northampton, who introduced him to the King. James, who was strangely attracted by young and handsome men, immediately took him into his confidence. He thought out, and put into practice, several projects which diverted large sums of money to the Crown. After having served in his appointment as receiver of Customs for Dorset and Somerset, he became, in 1613, Lieutenant of Dover Castle. Later in that year he was knighted, and was promoted Surveyor-general of Customs. He attached himself closely to Buckingham, and as Buckingham's favour increased, so Cranfield rose. In September, 1618, he was appointed master of the wardrobe; January, 1619, master of the court of wards; February, 1619, chief commissioner of the Navy!

Being now a widower, it was clear to him that further advance-



ment could be secured by marrying one of Buckingham's needy relatives. He therefore fixed his attentions upon Anne Bret, cousin of Lady Buckingham, and married her in 1621, having, in the meantime, got a seat on the Privy Council. This placed him in a position to take a leading part in the attack on Bacon. The Dictionary of National Biography says, "His opposition, no doubt embittered by a dispute which had arisen between the Court of Wards and Court of Chancery, was based on his objection to Bacon's policy with respect to the question of patents and monopolies<sup>1</sup>. By helping to secure Bacon's fall, Cranfield hoped to succeed to the office of Chancellor himself. James, however, appointed Bishop Williams, and consoled Cranfield with the title of Baron Cranfield. In September, 1622, he was again raised—this time to the title of Earl of Middlesex.

Bacon lived to see "the whirligig of time bring his revenge," and Cranfield was exposed as having indulged in several dishonest and otherwise shady practices by which he had built up an immense fortune.

In April, 1624, he was charged with receiving bribes, and altering the procedure of the Court of Wards, for his private benefit. He was found guilty by the Lords of:—

1. Mismanagement in the administration of the wardrobe.
2. Accepting bribes from the farmers when receiver of customs.
3. Misconduct in the management of the ordnance, and the Court of Wards.

On the 13th May, 1624, he was sentenced to lose all offices, and held to be incapable of employment for the future. Furthermore, to be imprisoned in the Tower, and to pay a fine of £50,000. Part of his sentence was "never to come within the verge of the court." No doubt through Buckingham's influence, he was released from the Tower two weeks later, but was not pardoned until April, 1625, after he had written a letter of abject penitence and submission to Buckingham.

It is impossible to feel the slightest pity for Cranfield. He had been a prime mover in a vile conspiracy against one whose genius, intellect and character towered above his fellow men, both Lords and Commons. It was *envy* on the part of the plotters which caused them to seek and achieve Bacon's fall. "A man that hath no virtue in himself ever envieth virtue in others." Those words from Bacon's *Essay of Envy* were not published until 1625. I believe he had his personal experience in mind.

R. L. E.

<sup>1</sup> Monopolies were an exclusive privilege, conferred by the sovereign or state on persons (usually a favourite) of selling some commodity. Elizabeth and James both granted patents of monopoly so freely that the practice became a grave abuse and scandal. Bacon's opposition in Parliament over a long period contributed much to the passing of the Statute of Monopolies in 1624, making them illegal unless granted by Parliament. It was dangerous to oppose the system as Buckingham and his satellites enriched themselves enormously from the holding of monopolies. If Cranfield could pay a fine of £50,000 (about £350,000 to-day), he had an obvious reason for wishing Bacon to be silenced.

## PSHAW !

By HOWARD BRIDGEWATER.

In a treatise entitled "The Dark Lady of the Sonnets," Mr. Bernard Shaw makes some comments about the author Shakespeare which, for some reason, would appear so far to have gone unchallenged, but which seem to me to call for comment lest some of those who read them should become misinformed.

Speaking of his friend, Mr. Thos. Tyler, who, he says, was the first person, rightly or wrongly, to identify the Dark Lady of the Sonnets with Mary Fitton, he describes Mr. Tyler as having been a specialist in pessimism, and adds that he followed up the *pessimism* of "Shakespear" (for some reason best known to himself Mr. Shaw deletes the final "e" from Shakespeare's name) with keen interest. I do not know that any other critic of the immortal plays has found them to be characterised by pessimism. A Tragedy is necessarily the relation of a fateful event which has a melancholy end: but Shakespeare's tragedies are all seasoned with highly instructive and encouraging philosophic utterances: his Comedies not only generally but invariably end happily, while his Histories abound with patriotic sentiment. And humour finds its place in all his works. A pessimist is one who regards the present system or constitution of things as radically bad for man; one of a desponding opinion. The whole character of the immortal plays denotes in the author of them a man of optimistic disposition.

One never knows, of course, when Mr. Shaw expects to be taken seriously, but his passion for singularity next finds expression in the work under discussion (which, by the way, is almost as much devoted to himself as it is to the Dark Lady) in the statement that he conceived Shakespeare to have been a person very like himself: "in fact, if I had been born in 1556 instead of in 1856, I should have taken to blank verse and given Shakespear a harder run for his money than all the other Elizabethans put together." Surely Mr. Shaw does not expect this braggadocio to be taken seriously. The fact that he was born more than 300 years later than Shakespeare should have enabled him, other things being equal, to have produced some literature of comparable merit, but I remember no saying of Mr. Shaw's that is quoted to-day when one wishes to put in a nutshell some cogent thought. True he startled the late Victorians by making the young lady in "Pygmalion" say "no bloody fear!" but the gates of immortality are not thus opened.

Further on, in his discussion of himself and the Dark Lady, Mr. Shaw makes this amazing assertion:—"The most charming of all Shakespear's old women, indeed the most charming of all his women, young or old, is the Countess of Rousillon in "All's Well That Ends Well." Now the Countess of Rousillon is, of course, a dignified dame, but to say that she is the most charming of all Shakespeare's

women characters, young or old, suggests that Mr. Shaw has not read the plays very carefully, for it indicates, *inter alia*, that he thinks that quite a number of old women are described in the plays. As a matter of fact, other than Katherine of Arragon, there is scarcely a reference in any of the plays to old women and certainly none of them is an important character. And to assert that this minor character, the Countess, is more charming than, say, Katherine of Arragon, Juliet, Isabella, Rosalind or Imogen is merely ridiculous. But, of course, we may probably ascribe it to Mr. Shaw's peculiar sense of contrariness to all accepted tenets.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor, *BACONIANA*.

Dear Sir

### THE ARCADIA (1593) TITLE-PAGE DESIGN.

I have studied Mr. Percy Walter's letter in October *Baconiana* with care and consideration, but I cannot find that he has produced any evidence against the facts contained in my article of July, 1945. The emblem in Camerarius, reproduced in *Baconiana* October, 1944, depicts a pig trampling on roses. The motto above it ("Non bene conveniunt") points out that foul swine and sweet-smelling roses are the very antithesis of each other. It signifies the contempt for worthy and beautiful things on the part of "the dunghill millions" (as the author of "Sir John Oldcastle" designates the rabble). The lines underneath this emblem surely make the intention and meaning apparent. It has no connection whatever with Bacon or Tudor emblems.

The numerical value of "Non tibi spiro" does not equal "I Queen Elizabeth." My count gives 152 and 154 respectively. Even if this little piece of juggling had resulted in a balancing act, no reasonable argument could be based upon it. We must deal with facts not fancies.

How and where does "the description in the October Aeglogue and Glosse in 'The Shepheardes Calender' agree with the identity of the two figures on the title-page." The description of "Eliza" is confined to the adjective "faire!" As for the "worthy" (Leicester), he is introduced and dismissed in two lines with an allusion to his crest! Mr. Walters applies the word "superficial" for the representations of "Dorus" and "Zelmane" which I quoted from the "Arcadia," and which are remarkably applicable to the two figures on the title-page? He cannot possibly be satisfied with his attempt to defend the Leicester-Elizabeth hypothesis. *Ex nihilo nihil fit!* Line 85 of this *Aeglogue* seems to me to be *apropos*.

Mr. Walters should read *The Winter's Tale* (IV, 3) again. I am sure he will then wish to withdraw his statement that Shakespeare "identifies marjoram with marigold." The Folio text reads:

Hot Lauender, Mints, Sauory, Mariorum,  
The Mary-gold, that goes to bed with Sun,  
And with him rises, weeping.

Need I point out that marjoram does not close up, like the marigold, with the setting sun? It is not related to marjoram in any respect.

Lastly, I must confess that I am completely baffled by Mr. Walter's reference to the quotation I made from the Preface to Coleridge's "Aids to Reflection." We are asked to believe that "Coleridge was probably 'instructed' as to double meanings, and could translate 'Sum caltha' as 'I am a boar!'" To this amazing flight of fancy, he adds, "The addition of the motto seems to confirm this!" By whom was Coleridge "probably" instructed? If he could make such a "howler," he was very improperly "instructed." He was, however, a good Latin scholar. The motto does not even "seem" to confirm any such "instruction," or glaring blunder as that now fathered upon poor Coleridge.

Yours faithfully,

R. L. EAGLE.

4th November, 1945



To the Editor, BACONIANA.

THAT MYSTIFYING WORD "HONORIFICABILITUDINITATIBUS."

Sir,

In *Love's Labour's Lost* (V, Sc. 1) occurs the well-known long Latin word which has been the subject of so much conjecture.

Moth asks the question; "What is A, B, spelt backward with the horn on his head?"

It is not difficult to spell HORNS in the long word beginning with the first letter followed by the second, fifth, nineteenth and twenty-seventh letters, or in a reverse direction, beginning with the twenty-seventh and continuing with the twenty-fourth, twenty-third, ninth letters and finishing with the first letter.

Holofernes later asks: "Quis, Quis, thou consonant?" to which Moth replies: "The third of the five vowels, if you repeat them; or the fifth, if I." This, of course, gives the vowels I U.

Let the long word be set down in the normal manner and a reversed form of it be placed below, thus:—

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
H	O	N	O	R	I	F	I	C	A	B	I	L	I	T	U	D	I	N	I	T	A	T	I	B	U	S
S	U	B	I	T	A	T	I	N	I	D	U	T	I	L	I	B	A	C	I	F	I	R	O	N	O	H

It will be observed that the letter I comes above the letter U in the twelfth column, and in the sixteenth U above I.

In the top line starting from the eleventh letter immediately to the left of IU, in column twelve, and reading from right to left to the third column inclusive, we find the letters BACIFIRON, which can easily be transposed into, I, I, FR. BACON.

Similarly, in the lower line, and reading from left to right, immediately after the occurrence of the letters U I in the sixteenth column, we obtain the same combination of letters which can be transposed in a similar manner.

Moth continues: "The sheep; the other two concludes it; O, U."

It will be noted that the letters O U and U O in columns two and twenty-six come before the anagrammatic letters N O R I F I C A B and B A C I F I R O N. It appears, therefore, that these two vowels (OU and UO) are purposely mentioned in order to indicate where the cryptic revelation, if such it be, is meant to conclude, and that the vowels IU and UI in columns twelve and sixteen respectively, to show where it begins.

Not only this; the reference to the sheep seems to be a confirmation that this method of superimposing the long word on its reversal was intended, because if we use the well-known Vigenère Cypher table we find that  $S \times H = P$ , which gives all the consonants in the word sheep. HS and SH occur in columns one and twenty-seven.

This *boustrophedon* method of reading alternatively from right to left and left to right suggests a horned animal, the OX.

The long word is found in the *Northumberland MS*, in the form HONORIFICABILITUDINI; in Bacon's *Promus* in the sentence: "Ministerium meum HONORIFICABO"; also in *The Complaint of Scotland*; *Magnae Derivationes*; and lastly, in the *Catholicon*, by Giovanni da Genova, which was printed in 1460, at Maintz (Mainz). The last named book has the following note on the long word:—"Ab honorifico, hic et hec honorificabilis, et honorificabilitas et honorificabilitudinitas, et est longissima dictio que illo versu continetur,—fulget HONORIFICABILITUDINITATIBUS iste."

In the foregoing citation from Giovanni da Genova I acknowledge, with thanks, my indebtedness to Mr. R. L. Eagle's book, "Shakespeare: New Views for Old" (p. 38).

MEDIO-TEMPLARIUS.

To the Editor, BACONIANA.

# ROYAL COAT OF ARMS IN FIRST FOLIO.

Dear Sir,

I was very interested in the Note on the Cupids and Royal Arms in the First Folio. At last someone is taking this up!

I have pointed out dozens of times that Francis Bacon uses the Royal Arms of a Tudor King, with cupids on each side and roses. His Arms contained the twin stars of Castor and Pollux, the Heavenly Twins! So he links his Arms with his Arms as King of England in the 1611 Spenser Folio. He also uses the Tudor Arms of England all through as head pieces and his Grandmother's Arms (Anne Boleyn), the crowned Falcon with sceptre, rather like the Shaksper arms, only the falcon has lightning in its claw. See Camden's Remains, who says these are Anne Boleyn's Arms.

I have a unique first copy of the Spenser Folio of 1611 and have *begged* the Baconians to study it. I did not know there was a Coat of Arms like this in the First Folio. It is very interesting. Perhaps the Chatsworth copy is unique?

Yours, etc.,

M. M. BAYLEY.

Lt.-Col. V. K. Birch, in a letter to the Hon. Sec. of the Bacon Society, says: "With reference to Miss Sennett's enquiry on page 108, October Number, my facsimile of the First Folio has the imprint, exactly as depicted by her. My facsimile was copied from the Folio in Bridgewater House, dated 1866."

To the Editor, BACONIANA.

# THE OXFORDIAN CLAIM TO SHAKESPEARE.

Dear Sir

Whilst reading W. Lansdown Goldsworthy's "Ben Jonson and The First Folio," I came across the identification (which I believe is absolute) for which he was so evidently seeking.

It is quite obvious that his purpose in writing this book was to identify Francis Bacon as the author of the so-called Shakespeare Plays.

And on page 38 of the afore-mentioned book, he quotes from "The Staple of News," Act IV, scene 2, by Ben Jonson. The whole point of this quotation, which I give below in part, is to disprove the claim of Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, as the "real author of the Shakespeare plays and poems."

"*Lickfinger*: Heretic, I see

Thou art for the vain Oracle of the Bottle.

The hogshead, Trismegistus, is thy Pegasus.

Thence flows thy muse's spring, from that hard hoof."

Mr. Goldsworthy proves his point most effectively, that is he disproves de Vere's claim, but he completely ignores the significance of the last two lines in the above. Surely "Hogshead" refers, not too subtly, to Bacon?

Substituting their definitions for the words "Trismegistus" and "Pegasus" we get:—

Bacon, the fountain of mysticism and magic, is thy poetic muse.

Are we not also to conclude, from the reference to the "hogshead" and the "hard hoof," that from head to toe, from beginning to end there was no doubt in Ben Jonson's mind that Bacon is Shakespeare!

Yours sincerely,

JUDITH SPIRO.

23rd October 1945.

P.S.—Since writing the above I have been reading Ben Jonson's *Alchemist*. And it was in Act II, scene 3, that I found a passage that throws more light on the quotation from "The Staple of News." It reads:—

"Are not the choicest fables of the poets,

That were the fountains and first springs of wisdom

Wrapp'd in perplexed allegories?"

To the Editor, *BACONIANA*.

### BEN JONSON'S ODE.

Dear Sir

Mr. Gundry (*Baconiana*, October, p. 133) alludes to Ben Jonson's Ode on Bacon's sixtieth birthday, quoting as follows:—

Thou stand'st as if a mystery thou did'st.

'Tis a brave causr for joy, let it be known,

For 'twere a narrow gladness kept thine own.

He asks, "What was the mystery?"

Surely the clue to it is in the last two lines:—

Give me a deep-crown'd bowl that I may sing,

In raising him, the wisdom of my King.

It was on January 22nd, 1621, that Bacon celebrated his sixtieth birthda York House. Ben Jonson was among the guests at the magnificent banquet. On January 26th (only four days later), Bacon was raised by the King and created Viscount St. Alban. He had evidently been informed of the coming elevation, and had communicated the "brave cause for joy" to Jonson who was literally bursting with desire to hear the news announced.

Yours faithfully,

PROSPERO.

1st November, 1945

To the Editor, *BACONIANA*.

### "THAT WAY MADNESS LIES!"

Dear Sir,

On the last page of July, 1945, *Baconiana*, under the heading of "Answers to Correspondents," appears a reply to a question put by a "Mr. Pirovshikov of Atlanta, U.S.A." The name is, as I have since discovered, a misprint for Professor Porohovshikov, who is a well-known exponent of the Rutland theory. He names seven plays (apparently chosen at random) and asks "why he (Bacon) did not insert some ciphered indication of his authorship of these masterpieces?"

He was entitled either to a reasonable reply, or to an admission that it is not possible to answer him, since no indisputable cipher indications of Bacon's authorship have been discovered with regard to the particular plays which he named.

I have heard from Professor Porohovshikov, who expresses his astonishment at "the silly suggestions of the writer." It was, indeed, a poor offering to his intelligence, and to that of Baconians in general. It was only necessary to point out that there is no reason why Bacon should have gone to the trouble of "signing" each of the thirty-six plays. Instead of this, an absurd attempt was made to supply *something*, no matter by what stretch of reason and credulity. The result was a tissue of fabrications having neither form, rule, consistency nor sense. A cipher, to be worthy of serious attention, must comply with all these qualifications. The contortions and distortions, which were served up, proved nothing except the peculiar mentality of some anonymous Baconian. Unhappily we all get "tarred with the same brush," and suffer accordingly.

In the "cipher" examples given, we find a choice of:—

- 1 Last speech
- 2 Last page (last line of the two columns)
- 3 Entire last page
- 4 Last two lines
- 5 Last line on each last page
- 6 Last scene.

We can choose which we like, and when and how it suits, in order to arrive at some convenient word or number.

Next, in order to aid our "calculations," we have a choice between:—

- 1 Roman words
- 2 Roman letters
- 3 Italic words
- 4 Italic letters.



To get some desired number, we can now add or deduct Roman words or letters, Italic-words or letters, or add "Roman words in brackets," or even "add one word 'finis.'"

After all this "cooking" and wriggling of letters, words and numbers, what we get is 66 in three instances and 111 in four examples. These are two of the numbers which your contributor *meant* to get by some means or other but no doubt he would have been equally happy, or more so, if he had arrived at 33 or 67 or 100 or any of the others which will fit one of the names and titles which have been conveniently bestowed upon Bacon.

We are told that 66 "is the cipher number of Fra Baconi (frequently so used)." When was it so used? Bacon could never have used such a "signature." "Baconi" could only be the genitive singular or the nominative plural of "Baconus." Neither of these could make sense.

It is stated in the reply that "Bacon in K cipher is 111." Bacon never claimed to have invented or used such a cipher. It was manufactured by a modern Baconian to supply yet another set of numbers to supplement the A-1, B-2, etc., code, so that desired "results" could be obtained when the simple count failed. Fi

Yours faithfully,

H. BRIDGEWATER.

[We regret having misread Professor Porohovshikov's name and misprinted it in our July, 1945, issue (p. 120). As for the criticisms to the replies given to the Professor, for which we are so severely chastised by Mr. Bridgewater, who claims that the signature readings are "a tissue of fabrications having neither form, rule, consistency nor sense," it may be said that they are extracted from the late Mr. Frank Woodward's "Secret Shakespearean Seals," which, with his later work, "Francis Bacon's Cipher Signatures," contain between them (though a few are duplicated) no fewer than 145 facsimile pages from Shakespeare's works, Bacon's own admitted works, and other sources, all of which display in full and explain in detail exactly the numerical cipher System. Of those seven plays mentioned by Professor Porohovshikov—not so much chosen at random as our correspondent seems to imagine—it would require an article of several pages to enter into full details of each. It must suffice to state that Mr. Frank Woodward sought to prove that Bacon signed his plays on the last page, as he did in every case of the seven plays in question, as follows: *Henry IV*, Part I, 111 (Bacon in "Kay" cipher); Part II, 111, last scene, (Bacon) 66 (in Epilogue, Fra. Baconi, Simple cipher); *As You Like It*, 66 (Fra. Baconi), 157 (Fra. Rosi Crosse, Simple), and 314, (Francis St. Alban, "Kay" cipher); *Hamlet*, last speech, 111 (Bacon); *Macbeth*, last speech, 111 (Bacon); *Othello*, last two lines, 66 (Fra. Baconi); also names of actors, two bottom lines each column, 66 (Fra. Baconi); *King Lear*, last page, last line each column, 66 (Fra. Baconi). In addition, in most of these plays Bacon's signature as 33, 66, 111, etc., is found at the beginning. Perhaps Mr. Bridgewater will kindly read the article, "Francis Bacon's Cipher Signatures" on pp. 13-17 of this issue.—*Editor.*]





MR. PERCY WALTERS.